Copy D

The COMMUNIST

AUGUST

THREE YEARS OF THE 7th WORLD CONGRESS PROGRAM
EARL BROWDER

The A. F. of L. AND TRADE UNION PROGRESS
WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

The CHARTER of PARTY DEMOCRACY
ROY HUDSON

ALSO FEATURES
FROM THE WORLD COMMUNIST PRESS

BOOK REVIEWS

TWENTY CENTS

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TWO BOOKS OF INTERNATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

THE PEOPLE'S FRONT

By Earl Browder

The authoritative statement by the leader of the Communist Party on the Communist position on national and international affairs, including the constitutional crisis, the Supreme Court, intervention in Spain, the Soviet Union and world peace, trade union unity, the Negro question, and many other problems.

354 pages. $2.25

THE UNITED FRONT

PROBLEMS OF WORKING CLASS UNITY AND THE PEOPLE'S FRONT IN THE STRUGGLE AGAINST FASCISM AND WAR

By Georgi Dimitroff

This book presents the position of the Communist International on the basic issues of our time. It covers all important international developments since 1935. One of the special features of this book is an analysis of the nature of fascism and a program for combatting it.

288 pages. $2.00

Order from your local bookshop or from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York City

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOL. XVII, No. 8 AUGUST, 1938

The COMMUNIST

A MAGAZINE OF THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MARXISM-LENINISM
PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE U.S.A.
EDITORS: EARL BROWDER, ALEX BITTELMAN, V. J. JEROME

CONTENTS

Review of the Month	A. B.	675
The American Federation of Labor and Trade Union Progress	WILLIAM Z. FOSTER	689
Three Years' Application of the Program of the Seventh World Congress	EARL BROWDER	699
The Charter of Party Democracy	ROY HUDSON	704
A Historic View of the Struggle for Democracy	ALEX BITTELMAN	711
Work Among National Groups—A Central Communist Task	I. AMTER	722
Lovestoneism—Twin of Fascist-Trotskyism	CARL REEVE	732
Has the Crisis Run Its Course?	GEORGE BRAHNS	743
With Unity We Shall Conquer!	JOSE DIAZ	749
From the World Communist Press		752
Book Reviews	D. C. LUCAS VALERIA HODGES	762

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Send checks, money orders and correspondence to THE COMMUNIST, *P. O. Box 148, Sta. D (50 E. 13th St.), New York. Subscription rates: $2.00 a year; $1.00 for six months; foreign and Canada $2.50 a year. Single copies 20 cents.*

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Marxist Book-of-the-Month Selection for August

THE PERIL OF FASCISM

The Crisis of American Democracy

By A. B. MAGIL and HENRY STEVENS

320 pages Price $2.00

A brilliant study of current political tendencies and the rise of the democratic front in the United States. The authors provide exhaustive factual material exposing big business as the fountainhead of incipient fascism, and describe in detail the various terrorist, fascist, and reactionary groups and organization in the United States, and their tie-up with Wall Street.

This book is the key to a clear understanding of the forces in the 1938 election struggle. It not only analyzes the nature of fascism in general, and American fascism in particular, but presents a program to combat it. It is a product of the activity and experience of the Communist Party and is based on the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, applied to the pressing problems confronting the people of America today. Every American will want to read it.

●

Order from your local bookshop or from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York City

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REVIEW OF THE MONTH

Prospects for Temporary Business Improvement. How to Insure Its Realization and Prevent Subsequent Slump. Heavy Industry and World Aspects of Crisis. United States Steel Makes Tactical Retreat. Resist Wage Cuts and Combat New Tendencies for Monopoly Control. Old Sabotage in New Forms. Housing, Railroads, Banking. On Liberals, Conservatives, and a Return to the 'Twenties. Barton and Landon Present a "Liberal" Face. The True Aims of Republican Party Reaction. Fascistic Conservatism. Republicans Tactics in the Old Congress and Plans for the New. Roosevelt Underestimates the Fascist Danger and Need of Improving New Deal. On How to Make the New Deal Work Better. Election Platform of Communist Party. Chinese and Spanish Anniversaries. Defense of Republican Spain Is a National Interest of America. Three Years Since Seventh World Congress of Communist International.

WHETHER or not the rise on the stock market beginning at the end of June and the subsequent slight improvement in some business indices may be taken to mean that the crisis has reached bottom—this will depend upon many economic and political factors. At home as well as abroad. For the fact of the matter is that we are still in the midst of a most profound economic crisis which, starting in the United States, is spreading to other countries, most importantly, to England and France.

A business improvement at this time would by itself indicate nothing conclusively for the future course of the crisis. In this sense, *The New York Times* may be right when it points to the fact that:

"The monthly production index, which had fallen from 121 in September, 1929, to 103 in December, rose to 107 by February, 1930, and from 84 to 88 between January and April, 1931; but the general receding movement was not positively reversed until July of 1932." (June 24.)

It is therefore reasonable to assume that, at best, we may have a temporary improvement. Which, of course, will be good in itself. The danger, however, is that if nothing more is done by the government to combat the crisis than has been planned for thus far, the temporary improvement may be followed by an even worse phase of crisis than we have had up till now. This is a real danger.

For we must not ignore the fact, somehow overlooked by many economic commentators, that the economic crisis has begun to assume in some aspects world proportions. Even the League of Nations (in the latest report of its financial committee) is warning of the imminency of another world economic crisis. It speaks of a "profound and disturbing change in the world's economy dur-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing the last twelve months." (Capitalist economy, of course, for the socialist economy of the Soviet Union is not troubled by crises.) It finds that "the decline in commercial activity—in the United States, at least, where this disturbance seems to have begun—has assumed proportions so great that no longer can it be considered a slight recoil permitting confident hope of automatic recovery." In Great Britain, it finds that "despite great expenses of rearmament, there is a decline in industrial activity and commercial activity generally." And in France "there seems to have been a general decline since the end of last year."

It has been assumed by some that, if the crisis begun here last August were to be overcome rapidly, the economic situation in other capitalist countries, notably England, could be saved from serious deterioration, thus creating more favorable *world* conditions for overcoming the crisis in the United States. But this did not happen. Instead, the developing crisis here was beginning to spread abroad, making the overcoming of the crisis in the United States a job of greater difficulty and complexity. And this is precisely what we are confronting today.

The present prospects for a temporary improvement in business conditions rest upon substantial foundations. As has been noted universally, inventories in consumers' goods are decreasing. The relief and recovery measures of the administration, by adding to the purchasing power of the masses, affect favorably the conditions of the industries producing consumers' goods, tending to cushion the further precipitous decline in the heavy industries. The up-to-date successful resistance to direct wage cuts on the railroads and other basic industries (steel) is having the same favorable effect. Farm income, though at greatly reduced, crisis levels, seems to be holding up, due in large part to the government's agrarian measures.

All these favorable conditions, most of which were achieved in the face of the most bitter opposition and sabotage of Big Business, can give us at best only a temporary improvement. And for this we must push forward. But can we expect more than that from these conditions *alone*? Hardly. Not in the face of the profound crisis in the basic industries aggravated both by the continuing sabotage of the monopolies (though taking somewhat different forms) and by the extension of the crisis to other capitalist countries.

Take, for example, the probable effect of the relief and recovery measures. The W.P.A., even if it should spend its present appropriation in seven months instead of eight, will give additional employment to no more than half a million people, employing in all about three million. As to the P.W.A., it estimated itself that the "maximum possible exercise" of the new Public Workers Act, during *five years* of operation, "will create approximately 4,869,000 man-months of employment at the project sites" and "7,876,000 man-months of industrial employment in factories, mills, mines, forest, railroads, and in administration." A total of "12,745,000 man-months of work under normal conditions at prevailing rates of pay." This means that on the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

average the operation of the Public Works Act would create yearly employment for about 230,000 workers. This together with the additional employment of 500,000 by the W.P.A. gives the prospect in the current months for new employment to about three-quarter of a million—say, one million—people.

This, of course, is not all. Secretary Ickes is quite correct in thinking that:

> "In turn, this employment [speaking of P.W.A.] and the payrolls it entails will have secondary stimulating effects in increasing consumers' goods consumption. Shopkeepers, merchants, firms supplying consumers' services will in turn participate in the expanding circle of economic benefits."

But *how much* stimulation can this give to recovery as distinct from temporary improvement? Very little. Even if we add, as we should, the effects of the work of the National Youth Administration, and of the C.C.C., in fact, of the entire relief and recovery measure in all its ramifications, we cannot but reach the conclusion that at best this will help give us a temporary improvement. Because decisive here for the stimulation of recovery is the overcoming of the deep crisis in the basic industries (excess productive capacity and the sabotage of the monopolies) which is taking place in the midst of a developing recession in England and France, a further deterioration of foreign trade, and a sharpening war aggression by the fascist powers.

* * *

AT THIS point it is relevant to inquire into the effects which the cut in steel prices may have on the further course of the crisis. These effects will be manifold just as the causes which brought the price cut about are manifold. And the two are connected very closely, being as much political as they are economic.

There is little mystery involved in the recent price cutting action of the U. S. Steel Corporation. For one thing, the campaign against the strike of big capital and against the rigidity of monopoly prices has been making itself felt among the people. And in the face of the monopoly investigation authorized by the 75th Congress, Morgan & Co. could not but feel that the time was due for a little tactical retreat. In the making of this tactical move, Morgan & Co. were no doubt motivated by the pressure of economic considerations, the fact that the index of steel production was down at 24 per cent of capacity and was in danger of being driven even lower. Under the mounting pressure of the people's opposition to the sabotage of the monopolies (reflected in part in the many recent polls of public opinion), aided by the economic workings out of the crisis, the *solidity* of big capital's strike was forced to give way, creating apparently certain slight division in that camp. In addition, one must note the fact that the previous maneuvers of Big Business to deepen the split in labor's ranks and to tie up sections of labor with various groups of the monopolies did not register much success although the danger still remains. Hence, the tactical retreat of the finance capitalists who dominate the U. S. Steel Corporation.

Undoubtedly, this is a significant victory for the people—for the workers, farmers, and city middle classes—for

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the forces of the democratic front. It will have momentarily definite favorable effects on the overcoming of the crisis and on the people's struggle for recovery. But we must remember that the enemy has made here only a *tactical* retreat in the hope of making later a more effective advance.

U. S. Steel has forced upon the industry a certain cut in prices. This will tend to weaken the rigidity of monopoly prices generally and, to this extent, will help the people to overcome the crisis less painfully than would be the case otherwise. But in making this move, Morgan & Co. may feel now more assured to press forward *for wage cuts,* not only in steel (not perhaps in steel, to begin with), but in all basic industries. Conceivably, Morgan & Co. may find it advisable to begin wage cutting on the railroads, and also in the automobile industry, especially if the membership of the United Automobile Workers (aided by the C.I.O.) do not succeed in checking the splitting activities of the Lovestone-Trotsky stooges in that union. The monopolies want wage cuts. But it is clear that, if they are allowed to have their way, this will not only destroy the favorable effect of the price cut in steel, but will seriously undermine the prospects for the temporary improvement, not to speak of the prospects for recovery. A wage cut attack would more than cancel the new purchasing power (small as it is) which is being created by the government's relief and recovery measures.

There is also another thing to be on the lookout for. Part of the tactical retreat of Morgan & Co. was no doubt the consideration that the price cut in steel will enable the U. S. Steel Corporation to squeeze its smaller competitors, driving the weaker ones out of business, and extending the Morgan domination in the industry more widely and securely. That is, to achieve a greater concentration and centralization of capital in steel under the Morgan group of finance capitalists. Which means more Morgan power in the national economy and in all phases of the nation's life. Which means greater power for the Morgans and du Ponts over the people.

Are the people helpless against this dangerous possibility? No, they are not. The masses of the people, the forces of the democratic front, have it in their power to turn this tactical retreat of Morgan & Co. into a *strategic* retreat. Not overnight, and not so easily. But the possibility for it is fundamentally inherent in the present-day struggle for democracy, against the offensive of finance capital in the crisis, for blocking the road to fascism in the United States. It is the historic battle to limit the power of big capital in the economy and government of the country. It is the *unfolding and partial fulfilment* of the great program and policy, which issued from the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International three years ago, August, 1935, pointing out to all victims of monopoly oppression the sure road to victory, to victory over reaction, fascism and war.

In carrying on this battle, through the building of the democratic front, we are immediately concerned with several practical problems which have arisen in the course of struggle against the offensive of finance capital in the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

developing crisis. Here we must again take note of the fact that the relief requirements of the unemployed and of the needy farmers are not being met adequately. The utmost possible support must therefore be rallied to the demand of the Workers Alliance for a 20 per cent wage increase to the W.P.A. workers which would affect about 2,500,000 people (mostly unskilled and semi-skilled), raising their monthly earnings 15 to 20 dollars.

Equally, the democratic forces must support more energetically the demands of the youth for an extension and enlargement of the services of the National Youth Administration. Finally, greater attention must be paid by labor and the city middle classes to the support of the demands of the small and middle farmers that the existing agrarian legislation be made more democratic in intent as well as application.

And on the task of stimulating recovery more directly, we are confronted now with this problem in a *somewhat* new form. We face the prospect of a temporary business improvement which may make itself felt quite fully in early fall. Very good. But this will be taking place alongside of a deteriorating economic situation abroad (especially in England) which cannot but make more precarious this temporary improvement. In addition, it is to be expected that the sabotage of Big Business will continue, although in partly different form, such as the tactical move of Big Steel. This means that heavy industry (the foundation of the economy) will at best respond only in so far as the improvement in the consumption industries will make it absolutely indispensable; that is, *heavy industry will go on only from hand to mouth.* Besides, in "compensation" for price concessions, finance capital will press for wage cuts, even beginning to enforce them, at the same time seeking greater domination of more concentrated industries as in the case of Big Steel.

The problem, therefore, of stimulating recovery presents itself in this form: *to force a substantial revival in the heavy industries, making full use of the partial loosening up of certain monopoly prices while at the same time resisting wage cuts and improving wages, and counteracting effectively the tendency of extension of the power of finance capital, resulting from the new concentration trends set afoot by the price cutting in steel, seeking instead to limit further the power of finance capital.* This is today the concrete and specific problem of stimulating recovery in the interests of the people and of fighting for democracy. And the answer to this problem is reasonably clear. Wage cuts must not be allowed to happen. Wages must be improved. As to stimulating a substantial revival in heavy industry and combatting the extension of the power of finance capital, this is really one problem. The problem of breaking the sit-down strike of big capital. It can be attacked now—it must be attacked on three main fronts: housing, railroads, banking. This means:

1. The federal government should proceed full speed ahead with the broadest program of building houses at low rent, along the lines of the proposals of the Steel Workers Organizing Committee. This will help

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

revive heavy industry. Private capital should be utilized to the maximum possible extent. But it has become fully evident that main reliance must be placed in the matter of housing on government initiative and resources.

2. The railroads must be nationalized. This is now the only way of protecting the interests of labor, protecting the interests of the small investors, protecting the farmer and small business man in the making of freight rates, and enabling the railroads *to begin re-equipping themselves* thus opening up wide avenues for the revival of the heavy industries. This will, of course, tend to limit the power of finance capital, not only on the railroads, but in other spheres of economy as well. It will also involve for the large holders of railroad securities a certain process of going through the "wringer." But that will be all to the good from the point of view of insuring the realization of the temporary business improvement now in prospect and of *preventing a substantial relapse into still deeper crisis.*

Incidentally, it is well to remember these facts when we are told that nationalization of the railroads will "ruin" the industry and will precipitate a financial crisis. First, that 97 railroad companies, operating nearly one-third of the total railroad mileage of the country, are currently in the hands of receivers or trustees. And, secondly, that "railroads operating 87.1 per cent of the total mileage, did not earn enough to pay their fixed charges—interest and rent for leased roads." (*Journal of Commerce,* July 11.) Evidently, the roads could not be in a much worse financial condition as far as the economy of the country, and the small investors, are concerned. Nationalization could only improve matters.

3. The banks must be nationalized. For the purpose of stimulating recovery in the heavy industries and to give the government an effective financial lever to that end; for the purpose of preventing a relapse into deeper crisis following the prospective temporary business improvement; and for the purpose of counteracting the new tendencies of extension of the power of finance capital; for all these fundamental and immediate purposes we must have a nationalized banking system democratically administered.

All these are basic points in the program of the forces of democracy—of the democratic front. And on them occurs the struggle at this time, especially in the light of the crucial election struggle this year.

* * *

THE Republican Party high command is still far from agreed on the "best" means with which to approach and fool the people in the coming elections. Not that they don't know what they want. On this they are fully clear. They want to promote the offensive of finance capital on the political field. They seek not only "a moratorium on reforms," not only "a return, in effect, to the kind of government we had in the 'twenties," as President Roosevelt seems to believe. (See his fireside chat of June 24.) They want all that, of course. But knowing that a return to the 'twenties cannot be had without the most violent reaction and beginnings of fascism, the dominating forces in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Republican Party are working precisely towards that end: unrestrained monopoly rule, reaction, and the beginnings of fascism.

They know what they want generally and they also know their immediate objective. The latter has been formulated very definitely by the Republican Senate Campaign Committee. As reported by the *New York Sun,* the major objective for their election campaign is: "To turn the tide against Roosevelt legislation in 1939 in the hope of washing the Democrats from power next year." To achieve this end—

> "The Republicans' immediate aim, said Chairman Townsend of the Senate Campaign Committee, will be to build party strength in the Senate to the point where a coalition of Republicans and 'old line' Democrats can block legislation they deem undesirable."

In the House especially the Republicans are banking on a reactionary bi-partisan coalition. Says Mark Sullivan:

> "I have said that in the November elections the central question is, how many seats will the Republicans gain in the House. Equally important, however, is the other question: to what extent will the Democrats be New Deal and to what extent non-New Deal." (*New York Herald Tribune,* July 14.)

The objective, in other words, is clear: control of Congress by a reactionary coalition since the Republicans cannot hope under any circumstances to gain such control by themselves. The big question that still divides the high command is how to present the Republican case to the people, how to gain their votes, and to what extent to resort to open coalition in the elections. On this there are many "schools of thought" which break roughly into two categories. One would accept the issue more or less as formulated by the President—a line-up along liberal and conservative lines—and present the Republican Party to the people as the defender of traditional Republican conservatism. *The New York Sun* champions that course. It says:

> "It would be absurd to try again the tactics of 1936 and tell the millions that the better parts of the New Deal are to be preserved; that is nonsense. They must be told, they must be shown, that the Roosevelt policies are useless except for buying votes, and unless the turn away from them is complete the country will continue to sink—and at a rate faster even than it is going now." (June 21.)

This is, of course, not just old time Republican "conservatism." It is that, but on the present level of development where the reactionary circles of finance capital are seeking to open the road to fascism. It is therefore fascistic conservatism.

The other "school," which has many shades and shadings, proceeds apparently upon the assumption that open reaction will not gain the ear of the people. Today even less so than in 1936. Hence, the proposal is to camouflage Republican Party reaction with all sorts of liberal trimmings but to do it more skillfully than was done with Landon in 1936. Which means being "more liberal," resorting on a larger scale to unrestrained demagogy and deceit. In other words as was signalized by the last Communist Party national convention, "to give the Republican Party a liberal face."

Dealing with the Senatorial elections, the *New York Herald Tribune* urges upon the Republicans this policy as follows:

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"For the Senatorial posts, the candidates chosen must plainly embody beyond any possible doubt the essentials of American opposition to the New Deal. *But they cannot, in our judgement, be too progressive in their outlook.* If a candidate can be found who meets the fundamental requirements and is none the less by reason of his breadth of view acceptable to the American Labor Party, so much the better." (June 23.)

It would seem as though the tricky policy of camouflaging reaction with liberalism and progressivism commands more support in the Republican Party than the one of "traditional" Republicanism, although the outcome of this inner fight is still uncertain. What is clear, however, is this: that the nearer one comes to the Republican Party *ranks,* especially among the workers, farmers, and poorer middle classes, and among the youth, those which are still traditionally Republican, there the progressive orientation is popular. But there it is also sincere. These misguided Republican Party followers, Republicans by habit, want their party to be progressive and liberal. That is why sections of the Republican high command, reactionary and fascistic to the core, propose to camouflage themselves with progressivism, in order to hold this Republican following from deserting the Republican Party and in order to win non-Republican masses to the support of that party. In other words, to confuse the issues and to stem the realignment which is taking place in the country—the realignment which is bringing together the overwhelming majority of the people to the side of progress and democracy in opposition to the spokesmen of the monopolies and reaction.

Examples of the "liberal face" were presented recently by two prominent Republicans: former Governor Landon and Representative Barton. And though there are some slight shadings of difference, essentially they present one face. Bruce Barton's, we should think, was the more skilful demagogy. Speaking before the Indiana Republican convention, he started out from the traditional division between the Republican and Democratic Parties and sought to show wherein they differ. Which in itself is false, in the face of the present process of realignment which is obliterating the old meanings of the major party labels. Yet he stuck to these labels because it helped him to develop the "new tactic." Accordingly, he asserted that the difference between these two parties was this: the Democrats have ideas and reforms but do not know how to make them work. The Republicans take over the ideas and reforms from the Democrats and make them work. So, in this election also, he said: "We will not repeal the reforms of the New Deal. But we will put people back to work."

Because—

"We believe in change. We are not afraid of change. We refuse longer to burden ourselves with those who are unable to see that today's conditions demand open-mindedness, freedom from prejudice, willingness to change."

How is that for a "liberal face" to cover up reaction? Not bad. But only so long as no questions are asked; and none were asked at the Indiana Republican convention which, after listening to Barton, proceeded to nominate a "traditional" stand-pat Republican for the Senate. But the people

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are asking questions. They are asking: *How* will the Republicans make the New Deal reforms work *better* than Roosevelt does? Just ask "how" and demand specific and concrete answers.

Of course, there is a way of making the New Deal reforms work better for the American people. Much better. There is also a way of bringing recovery, putting America back to work, insuring for every one *jobs, security, democracy, and peace.* But that means what? That means shifting the burden of the crisis more definitely to the monopolies and rich. That means breaking the sit-down strike of big capital. That means limiting the power of Big Business in the economy and government of the country. That means concerted action by the peace forces of the world to quarantine the fascist aggressors. More specifically: it means more relief, more public works, nationalization of the railroads, banks, and munitions, better unemployment insurance and social security, democratization of the agrarian measures. This is the way to recovery, to jobs, to a better democracy and to peace.

Is Barton for that? Will the "liberal" face accept that? Of course not. And should he pretend to accept even that without flinching, he will only expose himself the more, because all informed people know that the Republican Party has become the main stronghold of the banks, railroads, munition makers, of reactionary Big Business generally, and that therefore no spokesman of these interests can *sincerely* advocate any such reforms and measures as are directed *against* these reactionary interests.

Similarly with former Governor Landon. He sang sweetly in his broadcast on July 6. And trickily, also. To prove that the Republicans too believe in reforms and progress and that they are the only ones who know how to make them work, he fell back on the seventeen million people who voted in 1936 for himself and against Roosevelt.

He said:

> "I think if you would take a poll of these 17,000,000 people you would find that an overwhelming majority of them believe in collective bargaining, but they believe in making it work. They believe in Social Security, but they believe in making it work. They believe in unemployment insurance. They believe in relief—relief to the needy and unemployed, but not the financing of a vast political machine under the false label of relief. They believe in a better distribution of wealth created, in raising the standard of living, and a great many other social reforms."

We quote at length to familiarize ourselves with the demagogy of the "liberal" face. What is wrong and false with the above? First, is the tricky effort to *identify* the hopes and beliefs of the *masses* who misguidedly cast their votes for Landon in 1936 with the true position, the *reactionary* position of the dominating *leadership* of the Republican Party, of which Landon is one. In exposing this trick, we say: it is true, of course, that large numbers of the seventeen million people who voted for Landon in 1936 (consisting of middle class people, farmers, and some workers) do believe in collective bargaining, social security, unemployment insurance, relief, better distribution of wealth, higher standard of living, etc. They believe in it fervently *because they need it.* The question which Landon failed to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

discuss is: *do the monopolies believe in all these things?* The monopolies which financed Landon's campaign and which are today the backbone and bosses of the Republican Party. Does the dominating leadership of the Republican Party, the *spokesmen* of the monopolies, believe in all these reforms? The question suggests the answer: they are the worst enemies of these reforms; they are the worst enemies of the bulk of the seventeen millions who voted for Landon in 1936.

And another question: *what about the reactionary conduct of the Republican delegation in the 75th Congress?* What was the policy of this delegation exemplified by Snell in the House and Vandenberg in the Senate? Did they support these reforms? Did they try to make them work better in the interests of the people? Everybody should know the answer by this time. The Republican delegation, in its bulk and official policy, joined hands with the reactionary Democrats to block, sabotage and destroy every one of these reforms which the bulk of Landon's voters believe in, according to Landon himself. Isn't this the answer to Landon's pretensions? Of course it is.

Moreover, the party of Landon and Hoover is planning to continue the same reactionary game in the 76th Congress to be elected this fall. As explained by Chairman Townsend of the Republican Senate Campaign Committee (already quoted in the foregoing), the aim of the Republican Party is "to build party strength in the Senate to the point where a coalition of Republicans and 'old line' Democrats can block legislation they deem undesirable." We already know what they deem "undesirable"—everything that is against the reactionary monopolies. And this is what Landon (and Barton) call "accepting the New Deal and making it work."

The demagogy is almost transparent but it is not any less dangerous on that account. Landon and Barton may fail but others, less openly identified with the reactionary monopolies, may succeed better with this demagogy. Because—and this is vital—the people want the New Deal reforms *but they want them to work better.* They want these reforms developed more consistently and broadly so that America is actually put back to work, with jobs for all and security and democracy and peace. The Republican Party would use a "liberal" face to gain power for the destruction of these reforms. Of this, we must convince the masses in the current election struggle. To do so effectively, we must bring forward to the widest masses *the program of the democratic front,* embodied in the election platform of the Communist Party. It is this program of the democratic front, parts of which the Roosevelt administration champions without fully and consistently carrying them into life, around which we must help rally the masses in the election struggle, building in the process the forces of the democratic front against reaction. It is this program of the democratic front which shows not only how to make the New Deal work better but also the road to sure victory over reaction, fascism and war—through a people's recovery, security, democracy and peace. *To carry the election platform of the Communist Party to the masses*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—*is the central task of the moment.* It requires utmost concentration and organization by the Communist Party from top to bottom.

* * *

REACTION is evidently afraid to face the issues openly and squarely, as Comrade Browder signalized at the Tenth Convention. It does not at all relish the efforts of President Roosevelt, initiated in his chat on June 24 and carried forward on his present trip, to promote further the realignment, to rally the majority of the people under the banner of liberalism and against reaction. *True, the President does not show sufficient appreciation either of the danger of reaction and fascism or of the great and immediate need of making the New Deal work better along the lines of the democratic front.* This is a great weakness. We must therefore show the masses how to do the job well by building the democratic front. Yet the realignment is proceeding and this we must help stimulate further with all our might. Labor's initiative in rallying the forces of the democratic front must be consistently encouraged, its united support to a single progressive candidate for each office must be built most persistently *despite all obstacles,* along with the systematic strengthening of all independent economic and political organizations of the masses and the building of the Communist Party.

Now, when we celebrate the third anniversary of the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International (August, 1935—August, 1938). after we have tested its policies in three years of intense struggle against fascism and war, before the widest masses of the people and with their participation, the greatness and correctness of the policy of the united and People's Front is plainly to be seen. It was the exact thing needed by the masses to face the new enemy—fascism—to meet him effectively and eventually to defeat him. Comrade Stalin had shown the way. And Comrade Dimitroff, the great helmsman of the Communist International, speaking the mind not only of the vanguard of the working class but of all anti-fascists and lovers of peace, has outlined the policy and the path of unity and struggle in the memorable days of August, 1935.

Since that time fascist aggression has increased and, with it, the danger of war and fascism. But because of the struggle for the policy of the People's Front, the forces of democracy and peace have grown also. The unfolding of the line of the Seventh World Congress has made our policies richer, more understandable and acceptable by the masses, more effective in the fulfillment of the main task—of blocking the road to fascism in this country and of defeating it in the world generally. Our own recently held Tenth Convention proves that conclusively. That is why pro-fascist reaction in this country (the MacNaboe Committee, for example), aided by the Lovestone-Trotsky agents of fascism, are so desperately (and vainly) trying to impair the effects of that convention. Comrade Browder's recent statements before the MacNaboe Committee and elsewhere, by showing convincingly that our Party is fighting in the front line of struggle for the democracy, freedom, and national inde-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pendence of the American people, have shown at the same time how effectively we are unfolding and realizing the line of the Seventh World Congress. He has shown how our policies are helping the American working class, and the American people generally, *find their way of collaboration* with the anti-fascist and peace forces of all countries, especially with the main fortress of peace and democracy—the Soviet Union—which collaboration is the only road to victory over reaction and fascism.

With the election platform and policies issued by the Tenth Convention, in realization and further unfolding of the line of the Seventh World Congress, we shall confidently fulfill our duties in the current election struggle for the victory of the forces of the democratic front.

* * *

THE MONTH of July marked two important anniversaries: the first anniversary of the opening of the Japanese war against China and the second anniversary of the fascist war against Spain.

Many things have become clearer since the beginning of these wars. The declaration of Comrade Dimitroff at the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International (August, 1935), that *fascism means war* has been borne out to the hilt. It has also been shown conclusively that the only way to stop the advance of the fascist warmakers and preserve peace is through a united People's Front and through the concerted action of the peace forces of the world.

Several more things have become clearer to the wide masses everywhere. It has become clearer that the fate of the world's peace lies in the hands of the working class and of all peoples who desire neither fascism nor war. And none of these have as yet spoken their final word. The time is rapidly arriving for this word to be spoken with all the authority and power that these peace forces command.

The potential peace front of the world has such powerful forces as the Soviet Union, the proletariat of the capitalist countries, the farmers, and the overwhelming mass of the people everywhere. Also a number of small nations whose national independence is threatened by fascism. Also a number of capitalist countries which are at present interested in the maintenance of peace. Among them are England, France, and the United States. This is as true today, and truer than it ever was. Yet—

"It must be frankly stated that the British 'die-hards' and the reactionary circles of the same breed in other bourgeois countries in actuality abet the foul deeds of the German, Italian, and Japanese robbers."*

Chamberlain's policies in England have on a number of occasions passed over from indirect support of the fascist aggressors to open support. This is seen in Spain, in China, and in Austria. And in doing so, the British Tories are trying to sell out, not only the peace and democracy of the world, not only the national independence of the countries attacked or threatened by fascism, not only the national interests of Britain itself. Chamberlain's policies of support to the fascist aggressors are beginning to

---

* Georgi Dimitroff, "The Guarantee of Victory," in *The Communist International* of May, 1938.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

threaten the national position of the United States.

At the Tenth Communist Party Convention, Comrade Browder said that "peace is a national interest of America." This is a significant and important truth. It means specifically that the victory of the Chinese people over the Japanese aggressors, and the victory of the Spanish Republic over Italian and German fascism—that *these victories are a national interest of America.*

It is fully evident today that the successful working out of the Chamberlain "realistic" policy means victory for the fascist aggressors: a menacing threat to the peace and democracy of the world and an equal threat to the national positions of the United States as well as to the national positions of Britain and France.

Suffice it to mention only some of the "smaller" fruits of Chamberlain's "realistic" policy which the *New York Herald Tribune* finds is not such a bad policy. It resulted in allowing Japan to collect the customs revenue which belongs to the Chinese nation. It produced the Anglo-German agreement on Austrian debts which leaves America out in the cold. It encourages such projects for a "peace" settlement in China, which provide for the carving up of that country into five spheres of influence under Japanese hegemony, with "due" regard to the interests of Germany and Britain but without mention of the United States. (Associated Press dispatch, Peiping, July 1.)

Our own reactionaries and pro-fascists, the traditional "defenders" of the national interests of this country, would logically be expected to get somewhat disturbed over the threat to the national positions of the United States, resulting from the fascist wars against China and Spain. But, no; that is not happening in this world situation. Their fear of democracy, of the threat which the development of democracy carries for their narrow and selfish group interests, blinds them to everything else. And so—

". . . it turns out that these circles prefer to sacrifice their national interests, prefer to endanger and even lose their country's positions, for the sake of maintaining their social and class positions." (Litvinov, *Daily Worker*, June, 27.)

There are representatives also of other circles of the bourgeoisie—

". . . who hold other viewpoints and who, while not giving up their class privileges, desire primarily to defend their state interests, their national independence, their national and international culture, and who see in fascism only a passing phenomenon." (*Ibid.*)

Pursuing this analysis, Comrade Litvinov reaches the conclusion that:

"The difference in foreign policy takes place mainly between those who stand for purely class interests on the one hand, and the national and patriotic-minded elements who reflect primarily the viewpoint of the petty bourgeoisie, the intellectuals and the working people on the other." (*Ibid.*)

This development is seen very clearly in the growing people's peace front in England rising in opposition to the Chamberlain government and in the People's Front in France. Along similar (though not identical) lines is developing the democratic and peace front in the United States. In the hands of these forces, with the growing initiative of the working class,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lies today the real defense of peace, democracy and the national positions of the United States. And the policy of concerted action for quarantining the aggressors is the road to that end.

The immediate practical steps are obvious:

Lift at once the embargo from Republican Spain. Send large scale material aid to China. Apply more consistently the good neighbor policies in Latin America and in the Philippines. Support the peace policies of the Soviet Union.

The people's peace movements must demand that these steps be taken at once (without waiting for the next Congress) by the American government in defense of peace, democracy, and the national positions of the United States.

A. B.

ERRATUM

Due to a typographical error, a line was omitted from A.B.'s "Review of the Month" in the July issue of *The Communist*. The sentence at the top of page 587, second column, should read:

"Again we would have politicians doing the lending and spending but these would be fascist politicians, lackeys of monopoly reaction, spending to enrich a small clique of finance capitalists and holding the mass of the people in a huge concentration camp at starvation levels."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND TRADE UNION PROGRESS

BY WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

PART I

THE LEFTWARD TREND OF THE A. F. OF L.

It is quite evident that the unions comprising the Committee for Industrial Organization have made decided progress during the great upsurge of the working class of the past few years. This progress is organizational, ideological, political. The C.I.O. unions have adopted the industrial form of unionism, united some 3,000,000 workers in the hitherto unorganized open-shop basic industries, dealt a mortal blow to company unionism, developed more advanced tactics (sit-down strike, mass picketing, etc.), worked out a system of centralized action between the various C.I.O. unions, drawn in new strata of unskilled and white-collar workers, set up closer relations with the farmers and middle class, etc. They have taken a long step forward politically by the organization of Labor's Non-Partisan League and have also developed a progressive point of view on many political questions—fascism, peace, labor legislation, etc. They have become a powerful factor in building the democratic front. In short, the expansion of the C.I.O. unions, by broadening out the structure and viewpoint and political alliances of the trade unions, has advanced the labor movement from its traditional narrow craft status far along towards a broad class basis.

The advance achieved by the C.I.O. is obvious, but what is not so evident is that during the New Deal era, the A. F. of L. has also made considerable progress. True, its progress is modest in comparison with the spectacular achievements of the C.I.O.; but it is real, nevertheless, and of great significance. If the Leftward trend of the A. F. of L. during the past several years has not been more clearly remarked by analysists of trade unionism it is chiefly because these people have been so blinded by the brilliance of the C.I.O.'s forward march that they have been prevented from seeing the dimmer outlines of the A. F. of L's progress.

The advance of the A. F. of L. has manifested itself in various aspects of its industrial, political and social outlook and struggle. But at the same time the A. F. of L. continues to show serious conservative, or even reactionary, hangovers in various fields of its work, and these are a constant threat to the advances that the organization has made in recent years. It is the purpose of this article to evaluate the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

progress made by the A. F. of L., as well as to point out the negative influences in the organization, and then to draw necessary conclusions from them.

First, let us see along what lines the A. F. of L. has made progress, after which we shall discuss how this progress occurred and what it signifies.

RE-ADOPTION OF A STRIKE POLICY

One basic feature of the progress made by the A. F. of L. during the New Deal period has been the development by its unions of a more militant strike policy. It will be remembered that following the loss of many big strikes in the steel, meat packing, textile, railroad and other industries, just after the World War, the A. F. of L. unions, from 1922 all through the boom period, dropped their militancy and developed practically a no-strike policy. Falling in line with the employers' drive for more production at lower costs, the A. F. of L. leaders degenerated the unions largely into means for speeding the workers—on the false theory that if the workers produce more they would more or less automatically receive higher wages and better conditions.

Cheaper and faster production became the A. F. of L. watchword. William Green declared: "The union is the workers' business agency for industrial efficiency." Strikes were pronounced obsolete; the unions hired efficiency engineers, and cooperation with the employers in speeding production became the new way to emancipation. The class struggle was condemned as a relic of the jungle past; Marx was declared definitely defeated by Henry Ford. It was the period of union-management cooperation, of the "new wage policy, of the "higher strategy of labor."

The effects of all this on the unions were disastrous. The number of strikes declined. About the only important strikes in this period were in the "sick" industries—coal and textile. No serious organizing work was conducted. Trade union democracy was almost destroyed and a fierce Red-baiting campaign raged throughout the labor movement; for the "new wage policy" demanded that at all costs the resurgent militancy of the workers should be suppressed.

The general result of this no-strike policy was that for the first time in their history the trade unions failed to grow in a period of industrial prosperity. In 1922, at the beginning of the Collidge prosperity, the A. F. of L. had 3,195,635 members; but in 1929, at the boom's close, the figure had declined to 2,933,545. Union morale was at its lowest ebb in the existence of the American labor movement. The no-strike policy had brought the trade unions into a grave crisis, even while the prosperity period still lasted.

But the great renaissance of the labor movement, born of the 1929 industrial crisis and beginning in 1933, shattered this poisonous official A. F. of L. no-strike policy. Despite the warnings of the A. F. of L. leaders (to which Norman Thomas added his voice), a great strike wave swept the country—in the coal, steel, textiles, auto, and many other industries, one of the high points of which was the great San Francisco general strike of 1934. In this wave of struggle the Communist Party and the Trade Union Unity League unions played a big

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

part. Before it subsided, the stifling A. F. of L. union-management, speed-up, no-strike policy of the Coolidge period was largely a thing of the past.

The general result has been that the A. F. of L. unions have developed considerably more militancy. A. F. of L. strikes are an everyday occurrence these days, and now no one is surprised even to see A. F. of L. unions (to the horror of their leaders) engaging in sit-down strikes and mass picketing. Much organization work is also being carried on, one example being the strides that have been made towards reunionizing the railroads. Probably about 1,000,000 new members have been brought into the A. F. of L. crafts in the past few years. As a natural result of this increase of trade union militancy, there has been somewhat of an improvement of democracy in the A. F. of L. unions, the former terrific campaign of Red-baiting in the unions—with expulsions, sluggings, etc.—being greatly diminished. For if the unions pursue a more aggressive policy there is not such great need for the leaders to repress the rank and file as there was in the days of the union-management, no-strike regime.

INCREASED POLITICALIZATION OF THE A. F. OF L.

The improvement in A. F. of L. militancy on the industrial field represents important progress; but what is even more significant is the decided advance in politicalization that has also taken place in the A. F. of L. during the past several years. Under the pressure of the big political mass movement, of the New Deal era, the A. F. of L. leaders have had to abandon many of their old fogy, "pure and simple trade union" anti-political ideas, and the A. F. of L. officially has thus definitely extended its conception of labor class politics. This lays the basis for more organized mass political action in the future.

Take, for example, the question of wages and hours legislation. From the time of its foundation the A. F. of L. opposed all minimum wage and maximum hour laws for adult male workers in private industry on the grounds that it constituted both an infringement upon the natural functions of the trade unions and an enslavement of the workers. Said a resolution in the 1914 A. F. of L. convention:

> "The A. F. of L., as in the past, again declares that questions of the regulation of wages and the hours of labor should be undertaken through trade union activity, and not be made subject of laws through legislative enactments, excepting insofar as such regulations affect or govern the employment of women and minors, health and morals; and employment by federal, state, or municipal government."

At the same convention, Gompers remarked typically:

> "If we can get an eight-hour law for the working people, then you will find that the working people themselves will fail to have any interest in your economic organizations."

This and many other A. F. of L. conventions consistently rejected various proposals for eight-hour day and minimum wage bills.

Such an anti-political attitude towards wages and hours legislation, based on the contention that it "would destroy the unions and make serfs" of the workers, persisted in A. F. of L. official policy right down to the New Deal period. But after that

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

time, we find the A. F. of L., pressed by the new political moods of the masses, endorsing the 30-hour week bill in 1933 and openly lobbying for the present-day national Wages and Hours Bill. And, of course, the reactionary fears of the A. F. of L. leaders have not been realized, such legislative demands are not injuring the unions, but, on the contrary, are occurring precisely in their period of greatest growth and militancy and are giving them further stimulation and breadth of vision.

A similar broadening of the A. F. of L.'s political outlook has also taken place with regard to legislation in various ways making towards compelling corporations to deal with trade unions. The A. F. of L. always opposed such legislation on much the same grounds as it did wages and hours laws—that it infringed upon the unions and tended to throw them under government control. But the A. F. of L., compelled by mass pressure to depart from this traditional notion, now supports the Wagner Act; its controversy with the N.L.R.B. relates primarily to the personnel of the Board and the latter's alleged bias in favor of the C.I.O. and industrial unionism.

The A. F. of L. has also, in the past several years, been constrained to adopt a more political attitude towards social insurance. For many years, its position was that the unions, with their benefit features, should take care of social security matters—with the general exception of workmen's compensation for accidents in industry. Thus, characteristically, in 1921, Gompers declared: "If we should establish the so-called unemployment insurance, every action of our life, insofar as it refers to labor and employment, would be subject to the regulation and the discipline and the decision of the government." But, at long last, the A. F. of L. is coming around to an understanding that the trade unions cannot possibly handle these gigantic and growing problems and that the federal government must intervene. Hence, we now see the A. F. of L. officially supporting legislation for unemployment, old age and health insurance.

The A. F. of L. is similarly taking a more advanced position towards government regulation and ownership of industry. The Federation leaders have always been notoriously opposed to all such legislation, although upon a few occasions they have been compelled to adopt still-born resolutions on the subject. In 1920, under the pressure of the radical Plumb Plan movement of the powerful railroad unions, they were forced to endorse government ownership of the railroads; Gompers, in his fight against this measure, suffered the greatest convention defeat of his career. The demand, however, remained a dead letter, and was dropped altogether in 1925 by the A. F. of L. But now, in the present railroad crisis, we find William Green, at the recent Railway Employees Department Convention, again stressing the demand for government ownership of the railroads. The A. F. of L. was also compelled to support the National Recovery Act, as well as other New Deal legislation regulating finance and industry.

Still another aspect of the growing politicalization of the A. F. of L. is that body's adoption of a more international position. After many years

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of isolation from the world labor movement (as distinct from the International Labor Office of the League of Nations), the A. F. of L. has just resumed its affiliation with the International Federation of Trade Unions, although in that body its representatives have already exercised their reactionary role by fighting against unity with the unions of the U.S.S.R. Moreover, the A. F. of L. leaders, who have had their confidence in their capitalist friends badly shaken by the harsh fate suffered by many reformist German trade union leaders at the hands of Hitler, have developed a definite fear of fascism. This is affecting their political politics. Thus they are also more than ever interesting themselves in the maintenance of world peace. Indeed, William Green's recent statement on how to check the fascist aggressor powers goes far in the direction of the policy of collective security and is more advanced than any peace program that has yet emanated from the C.I.O. Calling upon the "democratically governed peoples" to "stand together," Green says:

> "The only way to protection against irresponsible nations and to world peace is to set up international agencies for adjusting our common problems and for enforcing the peace of the world."

PART II

THE ROLE OF THE C.I.O.

From the foregoing brief resumé it is quite clear that the A. F. of L., pressed by the harassed masses of toilers, has made considerable progress during the past several years. It has adopted a more militant policy on the industrial field and has materially broadened the scope of its political work. But its progress was not fast enough. The A. F. of L. did not keep pace with the imperative needs of the workers. The result of this was the split—a great progressive section of the A. F. of L. burst through the hard shell of conservatism encrusting that organization, expanded rapidly into the new and dynamic Committee for Industrial Organization, and gave to the masses the leadership and organization of which the A. F. of L. was incapable. Now let us trace briefly the development of the split.

THE A. F. OF L. KING CANUTES

When the great crisis of 1929 roared down upon the country, it found the A. F. of L. quite incompetent to defend the interests of the masses. The trade union movement was in the hands of a corrupt and reactionary bureaucracy still drunk with its prosperity illusions of the boom period and paralyzed with its no-strike policies and union-management cooperation fallacies. This leadership logically fell into the tail of the reactionary Hoover administration, acquiesced in its hunger program of sharing-the-work and no relief for the unemployed, and so, Canute-like, tried to hold back the great tide of working class discontent that was beginning to sweep in irresistably.

While the Communist Party, in the vanguard of the developing mass movement, stimulated the workers in the early years of the crisis to strike against wage cuts, and conducted its great mass struggles of 1930-33 in support of unemployment relief and insurance, the A. F. of L. leaders sought

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to kill off these mass activities. They condemned all attempts at strikes and they voluntarily accepted wage cuts; they applauded the police for violently breaking up Communist-led unemployed demonstrations; and, especially, they fought against federal unemployment relief and insurance. At the 1931 Boston convention, when some 15,000,000 were unemployed, the A. F. of L. leaders violently asserted that unemployment insurance would break up the trade union movement; the A. F. of L., as at many previous conventions, once more officially condemned this measure, as follows:

"Compulsory unemployment insurance legislation such as is now in effect in Great Britain and Germany would be unsuited to our economic and political requirements and are unsatisfactory to American workers."

For their no-strike, no-fight policy, which vastly weakened the workers' resistance, the A. F. of L. leaders were glowingly praised by the great capitalist interests, who also slobbered over the betrayed workers for their "moderation" and "loyalty" in bearing the burdens of the crisis. But the A. F. of L. reactionary policies could not stand in the face of the huge unemployment, wholesale wage cuts in every industry, decaying unions, and mass starvation in cities and on the farms. The rising discontent of the masses, which the Communist Party did so much to stimulate and organize, eventually burst forth in the vast political movements, strike waves and organizing campaigns that ushered in the New Deal and were, in turn, further developed by it.

This huge movement of mass struggle shattered the ultra-conservative policies of the A. F. of L. The bureaucratic leaders had exposed their bankruptcy and inability to lead the starving people and they were simply pushed ahead by the tremendous upsurge. They had to drop their opposition to unemployment relief and insurance and also to other forms of social insurance; the great spontaneous strike wave smashed their no-strike policy, a hang-over of the Coolidge "prosperity" era; the sweep of progressive legislation made them abandon their antideluvian notions about wages and hours laws and various other forms of labor legislation. In short, the Leftward progress of the A. F. of L., which we have already noted above, began.

THE BIRTH OF THE C.I.O.

A. F. of L. progress, however, was too slow. The masses were running far ahead of their $10,000-$25,000 a year trade union leaders. The snail-pace forward march of the A. F. of L. official political policy and program could not satisfy them; so they turned to Roosevelt for guidance and gave his New Deal powerful support. And, likewise, the A. F. of L.'s still weak strike policy also proved inadequate. Especially, with their dinosaur-dated system of craft unionism, the A. F. of L. officials could not give leadership to the great demand of the workers in the open shop mass production industries for trade union organization.

This soon became evident when the great strike and organization movement started in the mass production industries in 1932. The A. F. of L. began to respond to its pressure. But its response was weak and uneven. True enough, the unions that were later to form the body of the C.I.O.—

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the miners, needle trades and textile workers—reacted rapidly and took quick advantage of the situation; they carried on many militant strikes and rapidly built up their membership; but the bulk of the Federation craft unions lumbered along at a much more leisurely pace. The A. F. of L. as a whole, did not respond fast enough. The masses ran on ahead, and one of the significant phenomena of 1932-33 was the growth of a large independent industrial union movement of some 400,000 members, principally in the basic industries—of which 125,000 were affiliated to the Trade Union Unity League. There was also talk of establishing a new federation of labor.

Green, Hutcheson, Wharton and the other reactionaries controlling the A. F. of L. Executive Council were both unwilling to lead the great mass organization movement so swiftly developing, and incapable of doing so. But a section of the trade union officialdom—Lewis, Hillman, McMahon, Howard, etc.,—did realize the significance of the mass upheaval and the unparalleled favorable industrial and political situation for trade union organization. So they stepped forward to give the masses progressive leadership, raising the key question of industrial unionism, without which elementary reform in union structure and methods, manifestly the mass production industries, could not be organized.

Now, for many years, with their customary snail's pace (as against the seven-league-boot strides of trustified industry), the A. F. of L. had been slowly broadening its primitive craft unionism through the various trades taking in laborers and helpers, by setting up tottering federations in various industries, and (once in a blue moon) by amalgamating an anaemic craft union with a larger and stronger one. But the A. F. of L. nabobs, with their vested interest in the still narrow craft unionism, confronted by the correct demand of Lewis for industrial unionism in the basic industries, could not adjust their slow rate of progress to the urgent need for the necessary great leap ahead into industrial unionism. They stepped on the gas a little bit, making a few concessions in the direction of industrial unionism in the auto, rubber, and certain other industries. But this was obviously not enough; and so, after futile struggles in the A. F. of L. conventions of 1934-35 to get a favorable decision on industrial unionism, Lewis and his supporters had no recourse but to set up the C.I.O. and to begin organization work, which they did on November 9, 1935.

Thus, the split came, not because one section of the labor movement was going forward and the other backward, as many think. The whole trade union movement was advancing on both the industrial and political fields. But there was a difference in tempo between its industrial and craft sections, the former traveling rapidly, the latter crawling along. It was this difference in the rate of progress that eventually tore the labor movement in two. The most progressive section of the A. F. of L., later becoming the C.I.O., was forced to step ahead and take up the work of organization that the A. F. of L. as a whole was incapable of doing.

The rest of the story is well known

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—the C.I.O.'s splendid organizing and strike victories, the winning of the great open-shop industries for trade unionism, the building up of the C.I.O. unions from 1,000,000 to 4,000,000 members, the treacherous, illegal suspension and eventual expulsion of the C.I.O. unions from the A. F. of L., the A. F. of L.'s campaign of sabotage and strike-breaking against the C.I.O., the development of a wide-open split in the labor movement, the extension of this split to the political field, etc.

PART III

THE NEED FOR TRADE UNION UNITY

The central task before the labor movement, in order to consolidate the progress, industrial and political, that has been achieved, in different degrees, by its two sections, the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O., and to create the conditions for a further general advance, is to accomplish trade union unity. So long as the present split in the ranks of labor endures the whole progress of the trade union movement, past as well as present, is in jeopardy.

Concretely the danger lies in the strategically placed high command of the A. F. of L. These reactionaries not only hold back the labor movement, but if the mass pressure were relaxed against them, they would drag it backward. The A. F. of L. top leaders are responsible for the split. They deliberately chose it rather than risk the dangers to their official positions and the change in the status of the skilled crafts which they believed would result from the influx of huge masses of semi-skilled and unskilled workers into the unions. They have not hesitated to descend to strike-breaking, sabotage of organizing campaigns, betrayals in elections and in fights for labor legislation, etc., in order to defeat the rising new movement of industrial unionism. They are now trying to develop a class collaboration, anti-C.I.O. agreement with the big employing interests that would be a real setback for the whole labor movement. And their support of the near-fascist Hague in Jersey City shows to what dangerous lengths their war against trade union progress leads them.

To overcome this negative influence of the A. F. of L. reactionaries it is fundamentally necessary that the militant new armies of the C.I.O. be merged with the A. F. of L. on the basis of industrial unionism in the mass production industries. The long-isolated railroad brotherhoods should also be brought into the general consolidation. This new unity and infusion of new blood would greatly raise the progressive tone and tempo of the whole labor movement. The membership would acquire new power and enthusiasm; this union leadership would be revitalized, and labor's progressive farmer and middle class allies would take new heart. Trade union unity would liquidate the grave danger of defeat and reaction inherent in the present split situation. It would give an enormous stimulation to the formation of the democratic front, and it would be the best answer to the rising danger of reaction, fascism and war.

But before trade union unity can be accomplished there are a number of erroneous ideas to be cleared away. First, there is the contention that attempts to bring about a merger be-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tween the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. are useless, because the A. F. of L., based upon an obsolete craft unionism, is dying out anyhow. But those who argue in this way grossly underestimate the vitality of the A. F. of L., which was strikingly evidenced by the manner in which its affiliated unions withstood the heavy shock of the rise of the C.I.O. There are many industries where craft unionism can still live.

There is also the argument that craft unions and industrial unions, by their differences in structure, are fundamentally incompatible with each other and cannot live together in the same national trade union center. But there is no basis to this contention. In many countries craft and industrial unions work peacefully side by side. And in this country there was no real reason for the split except the narrow, unprogressive attitude of the craft union leaders.

Still another objection to trade union unity maintains that craft unions and industrial unions cannot be linked together because the former, made up principally of skilled workers, are inherently conservative, while the industrial unions, based primarily upon semi-skilled and unskilled workers, are by that fact inevitably progressive. This, it is claimed, explains why the leadership of the A. F. of L. is conservative and that of the C.I.O. progressive.

In all this argumentation there is a grain of truth, but also much error. While skilled workers are usually inclined to be less progressive than unskilled workers, this is by no means always the case. Often unions of skilled workers stand at the head of progressive currents in trade union movements. And it simply cannot be said that the leadership of industrial unions is always progressive and that of craft unions always conservative. Recent American labor history teaches many instructive lessons to the contrary. Take the United Mine Workers, for example. Now it is the head of the historic C.I.O. movement, but only half a dozen years ago it was one of the most conservative-led unions in America. Or, take the reverse case of the Machinists Union. This craft union is at present one of the bitterest opponents of the C.I.O., whereas for many years it stood in the very forefront of the progressive unions of this country and was an ardent advocate of industrial unionism.

The plain fact is that the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. are fundamentally homogeneous. They are but two parts of one basic trade union movement and should be united. The interests of their members are practically identical, and there is nothing in the program of the C.I.O. that the great majority of A. F. of L. members would not vote for if given an opportunity to do so by their autocratic officialdom.

The variance in tempo in the rate of progress of the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. during the past several years, which we have remarked above, does not flow from essential differences between the two bodies. It is basically a result of the different attitudes of their respective leadership. On the one hand, the C.I.O. leaders, progressively-minded, put themselves at the head of the awakening workers and did a great deal to facilitate their advance. But the top A. F. of L. leaders—the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Greens, Hutchesons, Whartons, Wolls and Freys—real reactionaries, have used their official power against the A. F. of L. workers' progress and have had much effect in slowing it down. If the C.I.O. makes such a progressive showing and the A. F. of L. does not, the cause therefore is to be found mainly in the different qualities of their leaderships. And it is safe to add that when the A. F. of L. workers finally get into action they will throw off their present reactionary leadership and will develop another, much more akin to that of the C.I.O., and, hence, more in harmony with their progressive moods of the craft union memberschip.

The A. F. of L. and the C.I.O. can and must be united. And to accomplish unity is the task of the progressive forces of labor. This means, above all, that the C.I.O. has the responsibility to push the fight for trade union unity, jointly with the A. F. of L. rank and file and the progressive sections of the A. F. of L. leadership (for there are many progressives among A. F. of L. officials). This unity fight should be carried on far more aggressively than in the past. The first steps towards trade union unity at present lead through A. F. of L.-C.I.O. cooperation in the developing elections, in the fight against wage cuts, for the relief and recovery program, for pending labor legislation, etc. The question of trade union unity should be raised more vigorously throughout the trade union movement—in local unions and central labor council meetings, in state federation and international union conventions. Also, non-proletarian progressives, vitally interested in building the democratic front, should let their voices be heard on the question.

The time is now ripe for a great drive for trade union unity. The whole labor movement should be made to ring with the issue. The unity proposals made by the C.I.O. several months ago were not in vain, although they did not lead immediately to unity. They, at least, took most of the punch out of the violent internecine labor war that the A. F. of L. was then organizing by emphasizing the unifying role of the C.I.O. A new and more determined unity campaign by the C.I.O. can defeat the A. F. of L. reactionaries' present attempts to spread the split into the political field and also put the trade union movement definitely on the way to unity. The mass sentiment for unity rises daily and it will become irresistible if the C.I.O. gives it the necessary leadership. Needless to add, the Communist Party also has a grave responsibility in furthering this great work of working class solidarity and progress. The consolidation of trade union progress to date and the achievement of further progress depend upon the establishment of trade union unity.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THREE YEARS' APPLICATION OF THE PROGRAM OF THE SEVENTH WORLD CONGRESS

HISTORIC SPEECHES AND ARTICLES OF GEORGI DIMITROFF

BY EARL BROWDER

IT IS three years since Georgi Dimitroff delivered his history-making report to the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International, which first clearly laid down the policy of the People's Front. Three years, packed with events bearing the destinies of peoples, nations, classes, which equal in importance decades of previous history, and which prove more fully every day the inspired genius which directed the words of Dimitroff's report. It is a political contribution of major importance that International Publishers has issued a volume* containing Dimitroff's report, together with all his important articles and speeches during the intervening period, which register the application and growth of the policy laid down in the Seventh World Congress. Under the title of *The United Front* this volume has gathered a wealth of political wisdom which will guide the working class for many years to come.

It is important to return to these documents again and again; for those who read them the first time, they will come as a revelation of new depths of Marxian-Leninist analysis and directive; for those who have read them one, two, or three times, there will be new depths revealed, and new wisdom gained in a re-reading. For us of the Communist Party of the U.S.A., recent events have brought home to us, quite emphatically, how well we built in 1935 when we printed and distributed a half-million copies of Dimitroff's Seventh Congress report.

Testimony from our enemies, also, constantly raises the historic importance of Dimitroff's book. When in May, 1938, the Tenth Convention of the C.P.U.S.A. captured the attention of the entire country with its program of the democratic front, for jobs, security, democracy, and peace, and by its concrete application of the slogan, "Communism Is Twentieth Century Americanism," our enemies were both puzzled and alarmed. They saw that the Communist Party had matured as an American party, standing fully on its own feet, and sinking deep roots among the American masses; at the

* Georgi Dimitroff, *The United Front*, International Publishers, New York, 287 pp., $2.00.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

same time they recognized that our Party, far from separating itself from the Communist International, had by that very fact become more international than ever before, and more truly expressive of the great traditions and teachings of Lenin and Stalin. They recognized the tremendous growth of Communist thought in America as dating, especially, from the Seventh World Congress. Against the Seventh World Congress, therefore, and especially against Dimitroff, our enemies directed the fire of their attack against us, consisting mainly of forgeries, lies, and slanders. Every fistful of mud they have thrown against Dimitroff and the Seventh Congress is for us additional confirmation of the fundamental soundness of that brilliant contribution to revolutionary thought and action.

American newspapers, trying to discredit our Tenth Convention, almost unanimously carried a forgery against Dimitroff. They connected our convention with Dimitroff's report, then quoted Dimitroff as advising the use of the tactics of "the Trojan horse," and concluded that therefore the Party's Tenth Convention policy was a tricky maneuver against democracy, to get inside it to capture and destroy it. How scandalously dishonest was this attack can be verified by any person willing to spend a few minutes reading Dimitroff's own words! Dimitroff, after calling for united action of all those ready to defend democracy, even the most limited bourgeois democracy, against the attacks of fascism, had gone on to consider the situation *in the countries where fascism is in power and all democracy is destroyed.* Here, he points out, the Communists and all democrats must find the way to the masses.

"What is the Achilles' heel of the fascist dictatorship? Its social basis. Fascism has deprived the workers of their own legal organizations. It has forced the fascist organizations upon them, and *it is there that the masses are*—by compulsion, or to some extent voluntarily."

Pointing out the necessity of all democratic forces working together to *win the masses within the fascist organizations,* Comrade Dimitroff made his famous reference to the Trojan horse. He concluded his analysis of the tactics that *democracy must use against fascism where fascism is in power,* with the following words:

"Comrades, you remember the ancient tale of the capture of Troy. Troy was inaccessible to the armies attacking her, thanks to her impregnable walls. And the attacking army, after suffering many sacrifices, was unable to achieve victory until with the aid of the famous Trojan horse it managed to penetrate to the very heart of the enemy's camp.

"We revolutionary workers, it appears to me, should not be shy about using the same tactics with regard to our fascist foe, who is defending himself against the people with the help of a living wall of his cutthroats.

"He who fails to understand the necessity of using such tactics in the case of fascism, he who regards such an approach as 'humiliating,' may be a most excellent comrade, but if you will allow me to say so, he is a windbag and not a revolutionary, he will be unable to lead the masses to the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship."

This good advice is being followed in Germany by Catholics, Socialists, and Communists, by all the democratic forces. It is already producing good results, considerably weakening Hitler's dictatorship. Every democrat, every honest anti-fascist, should be delighted to have the problem stated so clearly as in Dimitroff's words. And

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

when we find those who deliberately forge quotations which make Dimitroff appear to say the opposite to what is above-quoted, then we can know that such people are working for fascism and not for democracy.

It is well to recall that already, three years ago, Comrade Dimitroff placed working class unity as the most important force in gathering the People's Front. If the French trade unions were fully unified, and increased their strength fivefold; if the Spanish trade unions are uniting; if the Mexican trade unions have emerged as a united movement over a million strong; if the struggle for unity of the trade unions grows ever stronger in the United States—much credit must go to the clear and ringing words of Dimitroff, who declared at the Seventh Congress:

"We are definitely for the re-establishment of trade union unity in each country and on an international scale. We are for one union in each industry.

"We are for one federation of trade unions in each country. We are for one international federation of trade unions organized according to industries.

We stand for one international of trade unions based on the class struggle. We are for united class trade unions as one of the major bulwarks of the working class against the offensive of capital and fascism. Our only condition for uniting the trade unions is: struggle against capital, against fascism, and for internal trade union democracy."

Fascism means war. The struggle against fascism is the struggle for peace. The People's Front program laid down by Dimitroff at the Seventh World Congress initiated the world organization of peace, which has begun to halt the fascist advance, which has already brought to grief the fascist plans for world domination by denying them victory in Spain and China, by postponing their assaults against France and Czechoslovakia, by crushing their first attempts in Mexico.

All these historic achievements were reached by defeating an avalanche of denunciation and slander against the fight for peace through the People's Front, denunciation and slander which drew its arguments almost entirely from the Trotskyite-Bukharinite-Lovestoneite groups of wreckers and fascist agents. These bandits suddenly blossomed forth in the capitalist press as "defenders of Leninism" against the "betrayals of Stalin and Dimitroff," and were echoed by every columnist and editorial writer, all suddenly "Leninists" in the fight against the People's Front.

And what sort of "Leninists" are these gentlemen-bandits whose words please the Nazis and Japanese militarists so much? They quote Lenin's denunciation of the "defensive war" arguments in 1914-18, in order to prove that in 1938 there are no "aggressor governments" against which the world's peace forces must be united, and thus they absolve Hitler, Mussolini, and the Mikado of all their crimes. They quote Lenin's famous slogan, "turn the imperialist war into civil war," to justify the P.O.U.M. insurrection against the Spanish Republic, to demand preparation for insurrection against the French Republic now, and to assure the Japanese militarists that they will do everything possible in their interests in America. They operate with the wildest Left-sounding slogans—but, it is worth emphasizing, they obtain the fullest sup-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

port from the most reactionary newspapers. It is clear beyond all doubt that the Lovestone-Trotskyite groupings in the U.S.A. are working in closest contact with fascist circles here and abroad, are working under fascist instructions. It is one of the achievements of the People's Front policy, and of Dimitroff's work in the International, that they have dragged these fascist agents out from behind their former masks of "dissident communists," and placed them in the pillory as common *agents provocateurs* for all the world to see.

It is worthwhile, on this point, to recall Dimitroff's analysis of this question, written in May, 1936 (pp. 179-180), when he said:

"It is really ridiculous when 'Left' phrasemongers of various kinds oppose these tactics, adopting the pose of irreconcilable revolutionaries. If we are to believe them, *all* governments are aggressors. They even quote Lenin, who, during the imperialist war of 1914-18, correctly rejected the argument of the social-chauvinists that 'we were attacked and we are defending ourselves.' But the world at that time was divided into two military-imperialist coalitions which were equally striving to establish their world hegemony, and which had equally prepared and provoked the imperialist war. At that time there were neither countries where the proletariat had conquered nor countries with a fascist dictatorship.

"But now the situation is different. Now we have: (1) a proletarian state which is the greatest bulwark of peace; (2) definite fascist aggressors; (3) a number of countries which are in direct danger of attack by fascist aggressors and in danger of losing their state and national independence; (4) other capitalist governments which are interested at the present moment in the maintenance of peace. It is therefore completely wrong now to depict *all* countries as aggressors. Only people who are trying to conceal the real aggressors could so distort the facts."

How fully Dimitroff's clear and ringing words are in the spirit and letter of the teachings of Lenin can be seen by one brief paragraph from Lenin's classical answer to the "Left" phrasemongers of an earlier day, who made similar obstructions to those of Trotskyism now. Lenin said:

"It is possible to conquer this more powerful enemy only by exerting our efforts to the utmost and by more necessarily, thoroughly, carefully, attentively and skilfully taking advantage of every 'fissure,' however small, in the ranks of our enemies, of every antagonism of interests among the various groups or types of bourgeoisie in the various countries; by taking advantage of every possibility, however small, of gaining an ally among the masses, even though this ally be temporary, vacillating, unstable, unreliable and conditional. Those who do not understand this, do not understand a grain of Marxism and of scientific modern socialism in general." *

During the three years since Dimitroff's great report, millions of workers, farmers, and middle class people have learned from it, from its application by the Communists in the various countries, and from their own experience, above all, the necessity of the People's Front, of the unity of all democratic forces against reaction, fascism, and war. By no means least in this progress are the masses in the United States.

It would be wrong to think that the Communist Party of the U.S.A. has won millions to the socialist revolution. It has not. Those who go with the Communist Party all the way to its full program probably count less than two millions in the U.S., and the Party membership itself has but

* Lenin, *"Left-Wing" Communism, An Infantile Disorder*, p. 52, International Publishers, New York.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

passed the 75,000 mark. But the immediate influence of the Communists on questions of the day, of the struggle against fascism, against reaction, and for peace, cannot be measured within such limits. It is not too much to say that this immediate influence has become one of the decisive factors in the political life of America. Why this is so will be more thoroughly understood by a careful re-reading of the whole of Dimitroff's book, *The United Front.*

Evidence of this fact is to be seen in the increasingly frenzied attacks against the Communist Party, in reactionary circles engaging in grotesque exaggerations of Communist strength, and in the universal interest in the Communist Party and what it stands for. It can be seen in the widespread acceptance, among tens of millions, of the basic idea of the democratic front and the main items of its program, which have been broadcast by the Communists.

The ideas of Dimitroff have become the common possession of millions of Americans. They are already a living force in American life.

DIMITROFF ON THEORY

"Our theory is not a dogma but a guide to action, Lenin used to say. It is *such* a theory that our cadres need and they need it as badly as they need their daily bread, as they need air, water. Whoever really wishes to rid our work of deadening, stereotyped schemes, of pernicious scholasticism, must sear them out with a red-hot iron, both by real, *practical,* active struggle waged together with and at the head of the masses and by *untiring effort* to grasp the mighty, fertile all-powerful Bolshevik theory, the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin."—Dimitroff, Report to Seventh World Congress.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CHARTER OF PARTY DEMOCRACY*

BY ROY HUDSON

COMRADE BROWDER in his report has already indicated the reasons for redrafting the constitution. He stated that the constitution would have to dispel all vagueness and uncertainty about the Party, its fundamental program, its structure, and its relationship to the entire world.

Therefore the constitution before us and the one we shall finally adopt after discussion must be more than a mere codification of the rules. It must be an important instrument in strengthening our organization and in promoting our efficiency. It must be American to the core, and in accord with the basic teachings of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin. It must be a guide and handbook for our Party members as well as an effective answer to our critics, and a rebuff to the slanders of our enemies. Because we have based ourselves on experience, because of the help of Comrade Browder in drafting the constitution, because literally thousands of members of our Party have been drawn into the work, I think that the document we finally adopt after our deliberations will meet these needs.

The constitution has been the property of our membership for over a month. It has been widely discussed, not only by our membership, but in the public press and by sympathizers and friends. The membership of our Party has expressed practically unanimous agreement with the principles and basic features of the constitution. Out of this entire discussion, participated in by tens of thousands of people, only three or four proposals came forward that in any manner express disagreement with the line of our draft constitution. These disagreements were rejected by your commission, which registers unanimous approval of the political line of the constitution.

This unanimity does not indicate, however, that there was not a critical examination of the draft constitution and by-laws by our Party membership or your commission. On the contrary, we can say that the draft was gone over literally with a fine-tooth comb, and as a result of this thorough examination by the mass of our membership, many proposals came forward that were of a practical nature and tended to improve and strengthen the document without in any manner modifying its political line. Forty-five organizations and individual Party members submitted amendments to the constitution for consideration. In addition to these proposals hundreds of others were considered in various state organizations and conventions.

* Report delivered at Tenth National Convention of the Communist Party, U.S.A., May, 31, 1938. Condensed text.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We can therefore say that many of the proposals which have been considered in the commission represent the sum total of many other recommendations previously considered. Likewise, a number of propositions were made by members of the commission in the commission meetings. All suggestions and amendments from any source, whether Party or non-Party, that came before the commission received consideration.

Your commission, after a thorough discussion of the constitution and by-laws and consideration of all the amendments proposed and arguments made, wishes to make recommendations which we believe will further strengthen and improve our document. These recommendations total 29 in number.

The proposed recommendations are as follows: First, we propose to reformulate nine sections of the draft constitution for the purpose of simplifying the language. Second, we find it necessary to strengthen ten of the existing sections by adding to them. Third, two new sections dealing with suggestions not dealt with in the draft are proposed for inclusion. Fourth, as regards the by-laws, one section is reformulated and reorganized; two of the existing sections have additions, and it is proposed to include two new sections not dealt with in the draft.

Here I would like to speak on one other topic and make a proposal in connection with it. One of the things we set ourselves in drafting the constitution and by-laws was the language of the document. Quite a number of resolutions came in upon this subject expressing the opinion of the membership. For instance, I want to quote one here because it comes from a writers' unit: "As a writers' unit we have further resolved to record our unqualified admiration of the Central Committee's clear, concise and eloquent formulations." And I think generally we can accept this statement as long as it does not imply that there is no room for improvement. That there is room for improvement is shown by the proposed 70 to 80 editorial changes, involving changes of words, typographical corrections, improvements in grammar and language.

IN REGARD TO MEMBERSHIP QUALIFICATIONS

Article III. Section 1. One amendment proposed that the words "religious belief" be stricken out of Section 1, on the grounds that such a clause is un-Marxian and would also establish the right of priests and rabbis to join and influence the Party.

The un-Marxian nature of this argument and proposed amendment is attested to by the following statement of Comrade Stalin with reference to qualification for Party membership in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union:

> "We have no conditions of Party membership which demand that a candidate for Party membership be an atheist. The conditions of membership in our Party are: acceptance of the program and rules of the Party; absolute subordination to the decisions of the Party and its organs; payment of membership dues and membership in one of the Party locals."

Your commission, therefore, rejected this amendment.

A number of amendments to Section 1, dealing with the question of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

citizenship, were considered. These proposed amendments fell into two categories: (1) those that opposed the provision in principle on the grounds that it was contrary to revolutionary theory and the spirit of internationalism; (2) those that took into account the fact that there are certain categories of workers and people who desire to become citizens but are denied this right by certain existing unjust and undemocratic laws.

With reference to the first argument, which is actually a reactionary and non-revolutionary one, this question has been debated in other countries and dealt with specifically by Comrade Lenin in an article entitled, "The Task of the Left Zimmerwaldians in the Swiss Social-Democratic Party," written in 1916, wherein he stated:

"Point 18: That all aliens, upon three months residence in Switzerland, shall become Swiss citizens. . . . A campaign to be carried on among the masses to explain the special need of such measures for Switzerland, not only from the general democratic viewpoint, but also because of the fact that Switzerland, owing to the imperialist situation, has become a state with the largest percentage of aliens throughout Europe. . . . The political disenfrancisement of the alien workers and their consequent political aloofness strengthens the growing political reaction and weakens the international solidarity of the proletariat."

If this was true for little Switzerland, how much more decisive is it in a country like America! On these grounds your commission rejected all such amendments.

In reference, however, to the second category of the amendment. Would the adoption of such a Leninist policy mean, therefore, depriving of membership those sections of people who are victims of unjust, undemocratic laws? Not at all. To do so would be un-American, undemocratic and in violation of the best traditions of international working class solidarity. All races and nationalities helped found this country, and the founders of this country did not recognize that any particular race or nation had a monopoly of citizenship here.

A plain reading of this section of the constitution should dispel all doubts. It says that we want our members to be citizens, to be able to exert all influence for the progress of this country. This certainly needs no justification. Therefore, the section proposes that persons applying for membership should be citizens or should have declared their intention of becoming citizens. At the same time, as part of its general program of defending and extending democracy, the Communist Party will fight for the democratization of citizenship laws and for the amendment of reactionary laws which are contrary to the spirit of Americanism and will accept into membership those people who, to all intents and purposes, are citizens of the United States and are contributing their utmost to the progress and greatness of the people of the United States.

In line with the letter and spirit of this section of the constitution we propose to incorporate in the by-laws the following provision:

"It is within the provision of Article III, Section 1, of the constitution that the following are eligible to membership in the Communist Party: (a) Persons who, by some present unjust and undemocratic laws, are excluded from citizenship and disbarred from

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

legally declaring their intentions of becoming citizens; (b) Students and others temporarily residing in the country; (c) All persons and workers coming from countries contiguous to the United States, engaged in migratory work, and temporarily in the country."

Your commission recommends that the first section of Article III stand as it is in the draft constitution. Second, that the clarifying clause that I have just reported be included in the by-laws of the constitution.

[*Interjection at this point regarding rights of American Indians.*]

Well, this question indicates that we did not discuss all specific possibilities. However, I think that this is covered under my report wherein we extend eligibility to those who are debarred from citizenship by unjust and undemocratic laws, and wherein we indicate that part of the general policy of the Party will be to fight for the democratization of the citizenship laws and against undemocratic and reactionary phases of them; and certainly in this respect, the Party will fight for the abolition of any laws that would restrict the rights of the original American citizen, and that is the Indian.

Our constitution wants to deal first and mostly with general questions of principles. Of course, there will be certain problems arising as to how to apply certain phases of our general principles which we must lay down. That is why we provided for the draft Rules and By-Laws, and that is why we believe the clarifying clause regarding citizenship belongs properly in the Rules and By-Laws.

As to the proposal to change the world "intention" to the word "desire," we must reject such a proposition, because it would tend to weaken what we wish to establish. That is, that the Communist Party of the U.S.A. is an American Party, based upon the American working class, upholding American traditions, working through the existing institutions of America. That is the first thing for us to establish. That is the reason for our including the provision of citizenship. The second and important thing, but not the major thing, is to establish that because we believe in this general principle, we do not accept reactionary, undemocratic and un-American laws as the excuse for keeping people out of our Party. I think that this concludes the summary. The question is now in order.

[*Carried with one opposed and no abstensions.*]

Article III, Section 3 (second paragraph). In regard to the pledge, an amendment was considered and finally adopted that is aimed to emphasize one of the most important tasks before the Party and before the whole progressive movement in the United States, and we therefore feel that we will strengthen the pledge by including the following words: "for equal rights to the Negro people"—to be inserted after the words "national oppression."

Your commission moves its adoption with this amendment.

[*Unanimously carried.*]

DEMOCRATIC CONTROL

Article VI, Section 12. Amendments were submitted that raised the question regarding removal from office for cause of those who may be elected by State and National Conventions. Therefore, taking into consideration

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all the arguments, the commission proposed to add to this section, so that it read as follows:

"All Party officers may be removed at any time from their position by the body which elected them or by the body to which they are responsible, with the approval of the National Committee."

Your commission recommends the adoption of this Section, as amended.

[*Question: I believe that some editorial consideration should be given to this. The way the section was proposed, that is, that every removal will require the approval of the National Committee, I think should be somehow reformulated.*]

The general principle upon which this was based was to establish the authority and responsibility of the National Committee in this respect for the purpose of tending, on the one hand, to establish guarantees and procedure that will ensure means of removing people who deserve to be removed, and, on the other hand, to guard against indiscriminate, loose and irresponsible removal of people from elected office. For this reason we established it as it is.

[*Unanimously carried.*]

FOR GREATER PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Article X, Section 5. There was one amendment that proposed the elimination of this section and especially objected to placing habitual drunkards in the same category as betrayers of Party confidence. The commission felt that habitual drunkards are in special danger of becoming betrayers of Party confidence, and rejected this amendment.

VIGILANCE AGAINST THE CLASS ENEMY AND HIS AGENTS

Article VI, Section 14. A number of amendments on this section dealing with our attitude towards Trotskyites, Lovestoneites and other enemies of the working class were submitted by units and individuals and were considered by the commission. These amendments fall into the following categories: those proposing elimination of the section entirely; those proposing to eliminate the section forbidding personal relationship with Trotskyites and Lovestoneites; those proposing to specify the other known enemies of the working class; and, finally, those urging the differentiation be made between Trotskyites, Lovestoneites and the people whom they might influence. What was the character of the arguments advanced in support of these amendments? Let us examine them.

One argument advanced was: why single these counter-revolutionary renegades out for special publicity when reaction has so many other powerful tools? Do not the makers of this argument fail to take into account that, because of the very advances of the working class movement, the other stool-pigeons and agencies of the bourgeoisie are no longer so effective and they must look for new tools? The agents of fascism, the Trotskyites and Lovestoneites, are harder to identify and expose, and therefore, more dangerous, because they hide their spying and stool-pigeon activities behind revolutionary phrases.

Other amendments, also showing confusion or a lack of desire to understand, argued that in mass organ-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

izations where Trotskyites and Lovestoneites are found, certain relationships between Communists and ~~our comrades~~ become unavoidable. Had the authors of such amendments given the matter a little more thought, they would have realized that the question here is not at all about such "unavoidable" relationships but about the *kind* of relationships. The relationship which this section of the constitution seeks to make binding upon all Party members in such cases is a relationship of loyal members of the working class organizations. The meaning of it is simply this: that it is the duty of every Party member, wherever he meets Lovestoneites and Trotskyites, to identify and expose them and to convince the rank-and-file membership of the organization that these are enemies of the working class, and himself to act accordingly.

As to the other rather naive question of whether this section does not display lack of confidence in the Party membership, the answer is obvious: those Party members who know and carry out their duty in this important matter will be glad to have this duty clearly defined in the Party constitution, and as to those few Party members who may be inclined at times to forget it or do not clearly understand it, this section will be very helpful to them in the carrying out of their tasks and duties.

Questions have been raised on the advisability of prohibiting personal relationships with the Trotskyites and Lovestoneites. But why should there be such questions? Is it not clear that "personal" relationship is merely a Trotskyite cloak of camouflage for drawing unsuspecting Party members into political relationship? Is it not clear that this is nothing more than a trap to catch, weaken, demobilize and eventually destroy the usefulness of good working class elements? It is fully clear. The few experiences which some people have already had with such so-called "personal" relationships, experiences which the unfortunate victims of the trap will not forget so soon, should be sufficient to prove the necessity of this point as a help to all Party members. It should be sufficient to prove that "personal" relationships which Trotskyites and Lovestoneites seek to have with Party members are nothing else but a trap which leads to political relationship and eventual destruction.

We also ask the makers of such amendments: What do you do when you discover that a long-standing personal friend or relative of yours has become an agent or spy for the employer, or who scabs in a strike? If you were to maintain your relationship with him after he has been exposed, would not the workers regard you as possibly a spy or a scab? Certainly, the attitude that is taken to an ordinary stool-pigeon must apply even more sharply to Lovestoneites and Trotskyites who are organized agents of international fascism.

Comrades, the fact that only a few amendments of such a character came forward, and these only from individuals and a few small branches, indicates the political healthiness of our membership and general unity and agreement with the need for this section of the constitution. At the same time, however, the fact that from among our 2,528 basic organizations there were 17 amendments upon

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this subject must give us thought. We must not dismiss this question because the number is small, nor should we attribute them merely to crackpots. What do these amendments reflect?

In one or two cases, they indicate a possible direct influence of the Trotskyites within our own ranks; in other cases, a general lack of understanding, especially among white-collar sections of our membership, of the role of the Trotskyites and Lovestoneites, and lack of vigilance and political alertness. It is particularly the lack of vigilance and political alertness that must be stressed. The conclusion that must be drawn is the need to impress upon every Party member the serious duties in the struggle against Trotskyism and Lovestoneism, to raise the political level of our membership, to improve the quality of our political work, to equip our Party better for the fulfilment of the great tasks confronting us today, so that even a small symptom of the political typhus of Trotskyism and Lovestoneism shall never be seen in our ranks.

In regard to the suggestion contained in some amendments of the need to differentiate between renegades and those who may be influenced by them, your commission proposes to include the clarifying word which would make the section read as follows:

"No Party member shall have personal or political relationship with confirmed Trotskyites, Lovestoneites, or other known enemies of the Party and the working class."

Your commission moves the adoption of the section as read.

REPLY TO DISCUSSION

It seems to me that some of the comrades feel that the intention of the section, and the amendment proposed, is for the purpose of establishing the kind of Trotskyites with whom our Party members can associate. That is not the purpose. On this matter, Party organizations and the healthy political instincts of our Party can be relied on. We can determine who is and who is not a Trotskyite. In this sense the word "confirmed" is not intended to define certain "types" of Trotskyites for the purpose of regulating the attitude of Communists but is aimed at differentiating between Trotskyites and those people confused, muddle-headed, but essentially honest who may come under the influence of these rats. It is necessary to make this distinction for the purpose of sharpening the fight against Trotskyism, because we cannot, if we recall the words of Stalin, fight effectively and successfully against the influence of the Trotskyites and their propaganda, if we lump together all those who may be confused and influenced, directly or indirectly, by the Trotskyites, with the Trotskyites themselves. For this purpose, I believe the recommendations of the commission should be adopted.

[*The motion to adopt Section 14, Article VI, as amended by the commission, was carried unanimously.*]

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A HISTORIC VIEW OF THE STRUGGLE FOR DEMOCRACY

BY ALEX BITTELMAN

PERHAPS the best way to approach a deeper understanding of the democratic people's front would be by answering the following two questions: (1) What is it that makes the building of the democratic front the realization of the *policy* of the people's front? And (2) What is it, furthermore, that makes the democratic front only the *beginning* of the development toward a real people's front?

To answer the first question:

I

It is well known that in the history of our country, recent past and more remote, we have had many powerful movements of the people against reaction which are similar to, though not the same as, the people's movements of today which we view as movements of the democratic front or as moving in the direction of the democratic front. One can point to such historic milestones as the revolutionary struggle for the unity and independence of the country in the epoch of 1776 which established the nation and its democracy. One can point further to the series of truly gigantic struggles which resulted in the conquest of the Bill of Rights. And, finally, one will point to the struggle against the counter-revolutionary war of the Southern slaveocracy in the 1860's and to the period of Reconstruction. In the minds of the masses of the people, this first century of struggle for democracy is identified with the democracy of Jefferson, with the so-called farmer-labor democracy of Jackson, and with the democracy of Lincoln. It was the epoch of revolutionary struggle for the fulfillment of the objective tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in this country, hastening similar struggles throughout the world.

On the period of the Civil War in the 1860's, there is this additional thing that has to be said. It saved the Union, preserved the democracy of the country and, by abolishing chattel slavery, rendered the Negro people free in a formal sense. The forces of "Reconstruction" undertook to make this freedom real, more than formal, by attacking the economic foundations of slavery; but the subsequent counter-offensive of reaction largely nullified these efforts. Historically, therefore, the fight in the 1860's appears as follows: it continued the realization of the objective tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, but without completely fulfilling them. The task of completely unifying the nation, of thoroughly abolishing all remnants of slavery in the South, by radical eco-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nomic agrarian measures and the establishment of full equality for the Negro people, and the task of making more real the democracy of the Bill of Rights for the majority of the people, of developing democracy further, finding for it new and more effective forms —these tasks still remained on the order of the day.

Yet something new came into the situation with the conclusion of the Civil War and the period immediately following it. *It was the sharp class struggle between the growing working class and the triumphant capitalist class.* It was one of those turns in the history of a rapidly developing capitalist country in the latter half of the nineteenth century when correct, Marxian policies applied by the vanguard of the working class organized independently in a political party might have succeeded in rallying to the proletariat the mass of the toiling farmers and the lower sections of the middle classes, thus establishing *a more advanced democracy* of the workers and farmers *under working class leadership.* And by this very token the conditions would have been created for the later rise of a process of growing over of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into the socialist revolution. This process, which might have coincided with the rise of monopoly capitalism, lasting a considerable period of time *(but this kind of a "growing over" process nonetheless),* fully completing the objective tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, developing democracy to the end, thus reaching the "border line" of transition to the socialist reorganization of society, did not happen at the time, although the objective conditions were ripening for it. Marx and Engels so analyzed the situation and advocated a corresponding course of action.

As you well know, they advocated and sought to rally, nationally and internationally, full support to the struggle against the slaveocracy's counter-revolution, for the defeat of that counter-revolution, for the complete destruction of its economic base as well as military power. They urged the American working class to render this support and to press for a revolutionary policy against the Southern Bourbons, seeking to bring about such a relationship of class forces in the country as would enable the working class and its natural allies (toiling farmers, Negroes and middle classes) to make the outcome of the Civil War count for themselves, for their own advancement and position in society, in the same way as the outcome of the war of 1776 did for the bourgeoisie. This was the content of the policy of the First International as guided by Marx and Engels. The absence of a truly Marxian party at the time, able to apply this policy in the living struggles of the masses, was largely the reason that the course of affairs did not take this turn.

None the less, the struggle for democracy, during the period following the Civil War, did begin to take on new characteristics. The working class took part in this struggle *as a basic force,* though not independently as a class, and certainly not yet as a leader. Bourgeois reaction was becoming more prominent in the class policies of the bourgeoisie. Monopoly capitalism was coming to fruition, with all its economic and political consequences (imperialism, reckless destruction of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

resources and labor power of the nation, political reaction), consequences inseparable from monopoly capitalism, as analyzed by Lenin. The working class was militantly, though not with full class consciousness, resisting the encroachments of the monopolies. The farmers were entering the fight, as were the middle classes. And so, by the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the present century, we see a new upsurge of the democratic forces, most prominent among them the workers, farmers, and middle classes. Objectively, this new fight for democracy was no longer directed against a foreign oppressor and its native supporters, as was the case in 1776. Nor was it in the main directed against pre-capitalist forms of oppression (like slavery), as was the case in the 1860's. *It was directed largely against the new fountain-head of economic oppression and political reaction, against the new enemy of democracy, against the monopolies.*

One might say it was the old fight for democracy but in a new setting (nationally and internationally), with a new relationship of class forces, with a new main enemy to combat. It was another opportunity, in much more mature objective conditions, for the working class of this country to assume the lead of the toiling farmers and middle classes in the rising fight against the monopolies, for the preservation and extension of democracy, a fight which would have necessarily, and much more rapidly than in the 1860's, reached the point of transition to the struggle for the highest form of democracy, which is socialism.

* * *

But the working class, though more mature and advanced, still lacked the vanguard, the Marxist-Leninist Party, to guide the struggle along these lines. Hence, the struggle against the monopolies, for this reason and many more which cannot be gone into here, took a somewhat different turn. Populism took hold of these forces, and Bryanism. Populism was in the main a blind revolt against the monopolies and their anti-democratic, reactionary policies. It was fed largely by the resentments and ideas of the farmers and city middle classes. In consequence, Populism was saturated with petty-bourgeois illusions, such as the vague demand for a return to the old days of pre-monopoly, as though that was possible, let alone desirable. The independent voice of the working class was heard very faintly in Populism. The result is well known. Although these movements have played an important part in the political development of the country, *storing up rich and valuable traditions of struggle against the monopolies and for democracy, traditions which must be revived and infused with correct understanding*, these movements were bound to become dissipated, in the end falling victim to the machinations of capitalist politicians. They were bound to end this way because the working class, not yet conscious of itself as a class and of its historic mission as liberator, lacking an organized Marxist-Leninist vanguard, was unable to take the lead of the democratic forces and to conduct the fight along the lines of: Forward to new and more progressive forms of democracy, economically and politically, instead of back to old, pre-monopoly days.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This new fight for democracy, against the monopolies and monopoly reaction, experienced another upsurge in the years immediately following the first world imperialist war of 1914-18 and the victory of the great October socialist revolution in Russia. Capitalism had entered into its general crisis, the general crisis of the system. Before the whole world, a new epoch was opened up, the epoch of the socialist liberation. This epoch was analyzed by the Communist International as a rich and many-sided process of liberation struggles against all forms and remnants of oppression and reaction, the struggle of two worlds—a process including struggles for national liberation and unification, for the independence of small nations, for bourgeois-democratic revolutions, for completing the objective tasks of such revolutions as transitions to the socialist liberation, a process, in short, which embraces all forms and stages of struggle for the development of democracy to the very end and which must inevitably result in the world establishment of socialism as a new world system. This process was not, and could not be, analyzed as a uniform and straight line of development, leading from victory to victory. No living process goes on that way. It was analyzed as a *historic epoch,* registering victories as well as setbacks and defeats, bringing forth new forms and ways of struggle, in which the masses learn from their own experiences the correctness of the Leninist path, proceeding *thus* from stage to stage (sometimes in roundabout ways), and eventually reaching the socialist goal.

It was in the first several years of the opening of this epoch that we saw a fresh resurgence of the struggle for democracy in the United States. I refer here to the years 1919-1925, roughly, which witnessed the rise and then the decline of a whole series of labor, progressive political action, and Farmer-Labor parties and movements, the broad worker, farmer, and middle class opposition to the monopolies, to their imperialist war and post-war reactionary policies, the bulk of which subsequently rallied to Senator La-Follette in his presidential race in 1924. It was, in a sense, a resurgence of the old anti-monopoly and democratic struggle of the days of the Populists and Greenbacks. *Yet it was something new.* It was taking place in a new world setting: the general crisis of the capitalist system and the opening of the epoch of socialist liberation ushered in by the victory of the socialist revolution in Russia. One of the most visible symptoms of this new situation, the most visible though by no means the most decisive, was the presence of the Communist Party formed in September, 1919.

What was this new charactistic? It was the activities of organized labor, the trade unions, which played a basic role in these movements, taking the initiative in them. It was additionally the already far progressed class differentiation on the farms, with the consequent coming forward of the small farmer as a distinct force with its own demands. It was the participation of the Negro people. It was finally the influence of the young Communist Party which played in these developments a considerable though not decisive part. All of this was taking place at the time when both major political parties—Repub-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lican and Democratic—were completely under the thumb of monopoly capital, thus compelling and hastening a process of political realignment in the country.

Considering the national and international setting in which these movements were rising in 1919-1925, their *objective* meaning was altogether different from the Populist and Greenback movements, despite the ideas about them which the official leadership had. The dominant labor section of this leadership was reformist through and through. It was engaging in politically independent action to win a better base for class collaboration with the bourgeoisie. The dominant middle class leadership, as represented by the older LaFollette, was no more than bourgeois-liberal in politics while hanging on to some of the reactionary economic prejudices, such as the demand for a return to the days of pre-monopoly. Yet, despite all that, the democratic upsurge of those days had an objective meaning of a high and advanced kind. It was objectively the beginning of an alliance of the working class with the toiling farmers and lower middle classes against the monopolies and monopoly reaction in which the working class *would become the leader* and which would, under the then existing conditions, *develop* into an alliance for a workers' and farmers' government.

This, in fact, was the central slogan advanced by the Communists for the labor and farmer-labor movements of that time: for a Workers' and Farmers' Government. The meaning of the slogan in those days was to complete fully the objective tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution but merely *as a phase* of the central task, *the task of winning working class power,* of establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat resting upon the alliance of the working class with the toiling farmers and lower middle classes. The slogan "For a Workers' and Farmers' Government" was in Communist policy then synonymous with the dictatorship of the proletariat.

You will recall the character of the time in which this took place, a time very much different from the present. It was a time when on a world scale "the fascist danger was not as acute as it is today" (Dimitroff at the Seventh Congress), and in the United States that danger was hardly visible. It was a time when "it was bourgeois dictatorship in the form of bourgeois democracy that the revolutionary workers were facing in a number of countries and it was against bourgeois democracy that they were concentrating their fire." (*Ibid.*)

* * *

This upsurge of the democratic forces in the 1920's, which had in it most of the elements essential for growing into an alliance of the working class with other toiling classes for a workers' and farmers' government, was not able to grow in that direction sufficiently to become an important force in the country. For that there were many reasons which we need not dwell upon in detail now. Suffice it to say that the basic objective reason was that around the middle of the 1920's capitalist stabilization was beginning to set in, the relative stabilization of capitalism which became

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

possible largely because the reactionary leaders of Social-Democracy and Social-Democratism succeeded in keeping the working class split and in saving capitalism during the years of revolutionary crisis.

Among the basic subjective factors which tended to militate against the growth of the worker-farmer alliance in the 1920's, one should mention the relatively weak trade union organization among the workers, the reformist domination in the trade unions, and the weaknesses of our own Party. And here one must point to the sectarian and Right opportunist tendencies in the Party, and, in connection with them, the beginning of the factional division and struggle. It was because of these fundamental objective and subjective factors that, for example, Senator LaFollette was able in 1924 to switch the bulk of the Farmer-Labor Party development into the channels of what was essentially bourgeois liberalism heavily permeated with reactionary economic illusions of the petty bourgeoisie.

We now come to the latest rise of the democratic forces in the country—the present one—whose origin can be traced to the crisis years of 1929-32 and to the subsequent appearance of the menace of fascism. We saw these democratic forces beginning to press forward from all sides: the workers, the farmers, the lower sections of the middle classes, pressing forward against the offensive of finance capital and against the unmistakable fascist tendencies and actions of the most reactionary sections of finance capital. Hitler's coming to power in 1933, and the consequent spread of the fascist offensive in all capitalist countries, were intensifying developments here also. On the one hand, they were intensifying the reactionary and pro-fascist offensive of the monopolies and, on the other hand, they were hastening the rallying of the forces of the people to resist this offensive.

This process of getting together of the workers, farmers and middle classes, which began taking place around 1934 and which was able to defeat Landon and elect Roosevelt in 1936, bears several important new characteristics. And these we must never lose sight of. What are they?

1. It was the getting together of the democratic forces of the people—the workers, farmers, middle classes and Negro people—*to combat a new enemy*. The enemy was incipient and growing fascism. It was the advance of the fascist menace. It was not just the old fight against the monopolies which are reactionary and anti-democratic by their very nature. It was this plus something new. And this something new was the fascist orientation of the reactionary monopolies: the fact that the direction of their reactionary offensive was the destruction of democracy and the establishment of fascism.

2. The working class was beginning to come forward more rapidly *as a class*. Trade union organization, especially in the basic industries, was progressing with increasing tempo, with the C.I.O. emerging as a basic force in the life of the country. And here we are having a two-sided process. The advance of the working class was stimulating the further rise of all democratic forces, and, on the other hand, the active participation of the working class in the rise of the demo-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cratic forces was in its turn stimulating the further growth and consolidation of these democratic forces against the menace of fascism.

3. For the first time in the history of our country, the working class was beginning to establish contact and build up relations of collaboration, *as a class,* with certain sections of the farmers and the middle classes.

4. The new relation of the Communist vanguard to the mass movements.

5. The contradictions within the bourgeoisie: the divisions between the most reactionary sections of finance capital seeking a way out in fascism and war, on the one hand, and other sections of the bourgeoisie which tended to try to save capitalism by eliminating some of the excesses of monopoly domination on the basis of existing democracy. These contradictions, properly utilized on the whole by the working class and its vanguard, tended to exert a further favorable influence upon the growth and promotion of the democratic forces and for strengthening working class influence and initiative in the camp of these democratic forces. And—

6. Reflecting all these developments and influencing them in its turn, we witness in this period a most deep-going political and party realignment and the disintegration of the "traditional" two-party system.

To sum up all these new characteristics of the present growth of the democratic forces, what conclusions must we reach as to their nature and the nature of their struggle and tasks?

The conclusion we are bound to reach is the one given by Comrade Browder's Report and in our resolutions. It is that "against the reactionary and fascist offensive, the forces of democracy are organizing themselves, gathering more and more into a common front"; that, therefore, "it is necessary to bring the broadest masses of the people into the democratic front which, *under the conditions prevailing in our country,* represents the beginning of the development of a real people's front against reaction and fascism."

In saying this, we mean to say *two* things: (a) that the movement which is today gathering its forces against the offensive of reaction and fascism is a movement of the *democratic forces* of the people rising *to preserve and extend democracy.* And from this angle, *the present-day movement for democracy links up historically and traditionally with all our great movements for democracy in the past.* But this movement, as already shown, has some very important new features. Therefore, we point to (b) that *the present movement faces and combats a new enemy—fascism, that the working class is better organized, beginning to take the lead of the other democratic forces in the struggle against the enemy, that, consequently, this movement of the democratic front is a development towards a real people's front.*

Because, what is the people's front? It is, in the words of Comrade Dimitroff, *"a wide, popular anti-fascist front on the basis of the proletarian united front."* Have we got such a thing here already? No, we haven't. The thing we actually have in process of development is a drawing together of the democratic forces of the people against the offensive of reaction and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fascism. These forces in their bulk are not yet subjectively fully conscious of the anti-fascist nature of the front to which they are moving. Some of these forces are still very hesitant and inconsistent fighters against the fascist menace. And the proletarian united front has not yet been achieved, though we are moving in that direction. And, certainly, the proletarian united front is not yet the *basis* of the democratic front movement which is here developing, although the working class is a basic force in it. All this would show that we have not yet got a real anti-fascist people's front. But it also shows that, in building the democratic front—the bloc of workers, farmers and middle classes to combat the offensive of finance capital in the developing crisis and to bar the road to fascism—in building this front we are, on the one hand, continuing the best democratic traditions of the people and, on the other, we are going in the direction of the real people's front.

II.

Now, as to the second question: What is it that makes the democratic front only the beginning of the development toward a real people's front?

We have already touched on it before. We have said, quoting from Comrade Dimitroff's report to the Seventh World Congress, that a real people's front is "a wide, popular, *anti-fascist* front on the *basis* of the proletarian united front." And we have also pointed out that here the movement of the democratic forces is not yet fully conscious of its anti-fascist nature, that it is not yet based upon the proletarian united front, and that some of its parts are still hesitant and very inconsistent in the fight for democracy.

With all this clearly in mind, it is necessary to single out the most basic and essential class force whose relative position in the democratic front today makes it only the beginning of a development towards a real people's front. *This basic class force is the working class.* It is only when the process towards working class unity has achieved a high degree of development, *when the proletarian united front has become the basis of the gathering of the democratic forces,* that a real people's front against fascism becomes possible. And in the measure in which the proletarian united front becomes crystallized and thus begins to serve as the basis of the bloc of the democratic forces of the people, in this measure the democratic front here is developing and will develop into a real people's front.

See what Comrade Dimitroff says about the real people's front (I quote from his great book, *The United Front*):

"But when the scattered proletarian detachments, at the initiative of the Communists, join hands for the struggle against the common enemy, when the working class, marching as a unit, begins to act together with the peasantry, the lower middle classes and all democratic elements, on the basis of the people's front program, then the offensive of the fascist bourgeoisie is confronted with an insurmountable barrier. A force arises which can offer determined resistance to fascism, prevent it from coming to power in countries of bourgeois democracy and overthrow its barbarous rule where it is already established." *

* Georgi Dimitroff, *The United Front*, p. 199, International Publishers, New York, 1938.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This is a real people's front with respect to which our democratic front is the beginning of a development. Comrade Dimitroff says further in the same tremendously important work on the people's front and the role of the working class in it, written in December, 1936, as follows:

"While the split in the ranks of the working class, the absence of unity between them and the other strata of the working people, pave the way to power for fascism, the unity of the proletarian ranks and the formation of the people's front ensure victory for democracy over fascism, defend peace against the fascist incendiaries of war, and in the long run pave the way for the victory of labor over capital." *

This is the real people's front to which we are moving by building the democratic front. The thing is all summed up in this paragraph:

"The decisive role in the task of establishing a mighty people's front belongs to the working class. It can and must rally around itself all working people, all the forces of democracy, all anti-fascists." **

Writing in June, 1937, on the "Supreme Demand of the Present Moment," Comrade Dimitroff said:

"The proletariat is the most consistent fighter for the establishment and consolidation of the united people's front against fascism on a national and international scale. Without the proletariat, the people's front is altogether impossible. The proletariat is the main driving force of any anti-fascist people's movement, of any movement in defense of democracy and peace. The proletariat fights jointly with the democratic petty bourgeoisie, the peasantry and intellectuals against their common enemy. But the proletariat must rely primarily on its own forces, on the unity of the ranks of the working class movement in each country and on the unity of the international working class movement. For the more united and organized the proletariat is, the more truly will it be able to defend its class interests and the better will it be able to fulfill its leading role in the ranks of the united people's front." *

Let us see now what is the *relative* position of the working class in the democratic camp of such countries as Spain, France and the United States, leaving aside the different objective situations. This will help us get to the bottom of the matter.

In Spain the working class is the leading force in the people's front. Comrade Dimitroff says: "The Spanish working class, headed by the people's front government, is the leading force of the armed people." (Page 229.) There we have a real people's front, based upon the proletarian united front, with trade union unity on the verge of consummation, the Communist and Socialist Parties working together and coming ever closer to one another, and constituting the major parties of the Spanish people.

In France, what is the role of the French proletariat? Says Dimitroff:

"The working class of France, which began by establishing the united front in its own ranks, has linked its trade unions into a single Confederation of Labor, which now embraces more than five million workers, and has established a people's front. . . ." **

And this has taken place because the influence and strength of the French Communist Party enabled it to exercise the initiative in the unification process without which it could not have happened.

What about the United States? Here too we had (and are having)

* *Ibid.*, pp. 199-200.
** *Ibid.*, p. 211.

* *Ibid.*, pp. 236-237.
** *Ibid.*, p. 229.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

developments in the role of the working class within the democratic camp which are of most far-reaching significance. Says Comrade Dimitroff in the same connection:

"For the first time in the history of America, the working class of the United States is displaying its independence as a class, uniting its forces into mass trade unions and actively taking the lead of the democratic and progressive forces in the country against reaction and fascism." *

Great as this is, for the present as well as the future of the democratic camp in the United States, it is obviously not the same stage of development of the role and position of the working class as that in Spain or France. In the latter countries, it is a position of leadership made possible by a high degree of working class unity and by *a great influence* of the working class vanguard upon the class and its allies. Hence, the real people's front. In the United States we have a lower stage in the process of working class unity, only the beginnings of working class initiative in bringing together the democratic forces instead of leadership and a relatively smaller and less influential proletarian vanguard. Hence, a democratic front which is the beginning of a development towards a real people's front.

All these theoretical and political clarifications *have very important tactical consequences.* And what are these tactical consequences? They are of a twofold nature. First and foremost is the tactical rule not to seek to impose upon the forces of the democratic front, mechanically and artificially, such policies and forms of organization as may fit some sectarian pattern and scheme but which will surely choke the growth of the democratic front. We must remember that we are dealing with a democratic front, not yet a real people's front. It is precisely in order to obstruct the growth of the forces of democracy that Trotskyite and Lovestoneite agents of fascism, each in their own way, are conspiring against Labor's Non-Partisan League, denouncing its policies of participation in the Democratic Party primaries for strengthening the progressive forces. These fascist agents conspire from the "Left," seeking to force premature Labor or Farmer-Labor Party crystallizations in the hope of thus preventing the further advancement of proletarian class independence and the growing unity of the democratic front. Norman Thomas' slander against our Party that it considers the Democratic Party the realization of the people's front and his encouragements to Phil La-Follette—all this works in the same direction as the conspiracies of the Trotsky-Lovestoneites.

The other tactical rule is to build the democratic front *and to promote its development towards a real people's anti-fascist front.* This means, first of all, that the democratic front *has to be built.* It will not come by itself. And this, in the words of our resolution, calls for:

". . . the strengthening of all economic and political organizations of labor; the building of the C.I.O., the organization of joint action between the unions of the A. F. of L., the C.I.O., the Railroad Brotherhoods, especially in the forthcoming elections, leading toward the achievement of full trade union unity; labor's initiative in gathering the farmers, the middle classes and all progres-

* *Ibid.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sives into the general democratic front; and to defeat all efforts to split this front by reactionary Republicans operating behind a progressive shield."

The building of the democratic front demands *that the people be organized and led in the struggle for their demands, for their program, for the program of the democratic front.*

By doing all these things we will build the democratic front. We will at the *same time* be promoting its development towards a real people's front if we make sure never to lose sight of the following tasks:

1. To do all in our power, and always with the correct methods, to help develop systematically "labor's initiative *in gathering the farmers, the middle classes and all progressive forces into the general democratic front";*

2. To make sure that "within the democratic camp . . . the working class must itself display the utmost possible organization, unity, activity and influence"; and

3. That the building of the democratic front requires of us, American Communists, that we solve in the shortest possible time "the basic question" of building our Party "into a true mass party trained in Marxism-Leninism."

WE WANT NEW READERS FOR
THE COMMUNIST

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORK AMONG NATIONAL GROUPS—A CENTRAL COMMUNIST TASK*

BY I. AMTER

THE RESOLUTION of the Tenth Party Convention and the report of Comrade Browder correctly place work among the national groups as of tremendous importance to our Party and the democratic front. This is a change from the line of approach of our Party to this very significant question up to a few years ago—a shift that is in harmony with the line of the Seventh World Congress and demonstrates a proper understanding of the nature of the national groups.

Formerly work among the national groups was considered as being merely a matter of language. In view of the fact that each nationality had its own tongue, it was considered necessary and possible to reach these groups only through the understanding of the particular language. From this arose a conception that because there has been little immigration to the United States since the beginning of the World War, work among the so-called "language people" was of constantly dwindling importance. The immigrants to the United States, it was thought, more or less quickly learned the English language, became assimilated into the life of the country and thereby lost their character as a special group within the country. From this arose the idea that the language press would become less and less important as the number of immigrants declined, and face a very dubious future.

Our Party did not see the *second, third and fourth generations* of these immigrants. It did not fully understand the relation of the generations born in the United States to the immigrants who came to the United States. The rise of fascism in Europe, and the sharp nationalist tone and outlook that the fascist leaders and propagandists assumed brought the question of national groups very sharply to the attention of our Party and made us realize the full import of these people, not only as people speaking a particular language, but embraced by national ideals that were used for the purpose of inflaming nationalism, national chauvinism and division among the various peoples; whereas the correct policy for the unification of the people for progress was *unity of the various national groups for the democratic front and for socialism.*

* Based on report at Tenth National Convention, held in New York City, May 27-31, 1938.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

According to the 1930 census there

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are in the United States more than fourteen million immigrants. If one includes the second, third and fourth generations born in this country, the national groups represent a mass of forty to fifty million people. In fact, the census of 1930 reveals that only 57.1 per cent of the total population of the country are native white of white parentage. This shows the close affinity of the second, third and fourth generations to the immigrants. This is further emphasized by the fact that the national groups live in communities of their own, they retain to a great extent the habits brought over from the old country, and even influence in the community the habits and customs of the children and grandchildren born in this country. All of them are influenced to a great extent by developments and events in their native land.

It is necessary to analyze some of the differences among the national groups. Millions of immigrants came to the United States from Northern Europe, that is, Germany, the Scandinavian countries, England, and Scotland. These are the more highly *industrialized* countries in Europe and, in the main, *Protestant* countries. The people from these countries readily found a foothold in the United States, and were the backbone of the organization of the trade union movement. At a somewhat later period, there was a tremendous immigration from Southern and Southeastern Europe as well as from Ireland. These countries are in the main *agrarian* and *Catholic* countries. The immigrants were chiefly peasants and found their place in American industrial life among the masses of the unskilled and semi-skilled workers in basic and mass production industries. These people are low-paid workers. Because of their economic status they were and are forced to live in congested areas, which have become more densely populated as a result of the limitations of the national ghettoes. This has led to the serious problems of housing, health, etc., which face them from day to day. This affects particularly the Italian, Polish and Spanish-speaking people. Hundreds of thousands of these immigrants also became farmers.

For a long time the immigrants, and their offsprings, from the agrarian countries remained unorganized, since they were in the industries that the A. F. of L., which concentrated on skilled workers—that is, the aristocrats of labor—did not bother about. But with the emergence of the C.I.O., masses of these workers streamed into the trade union organizations. This means that today there are fully two and one-half million of them in the C.I.O., and hundreds of thousands have joined the A. F. of L. as a result of the drive of the C.I.O. This presents a tremendously vital force within the trade union movement.

Significant facts, however, must not be forgotten:

1. The crisis brought about a greater adhesiveness of the whole national group, that is, immigrants and those born in this country.

2. The rise of fascism intensified nationalism; the frustration of the desire to assimilate into American life brought about greater consciousness on the part of American born descendants of the immigrants.

3. The open and latent antagonism

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to Catholicism which is fostered by reactionary interests among large sections of the Protestant population of the U.S., and the necessity of a proper approach to these Catholic masses present us with problems that require the keenest understanding of the application of proper tactics by our Party.

THE NATIONAL GROUPS IN AMERICAN POLITICAL LIFE

The national group leaders in the largest cities use the radio very extensively, there even being special language stations. Consular agents also play a part in rallying the people of their nationality to the support of reactionary movements and campaigns. There are powerful nationality organizations, some of them built on a nationwide scale and embracing hundreds of thousands of members. There are also a number of county and town organizations, representing people coming from certain counties, provinces and towns of Europe. There are political clubs of the Democratic and Republican Parties made up of people of a particular national group, used by the reactionary national group leaders to herd the votes for the reactionary parties.

This opens a whole field of work among a most important section of the population entrenched in basic industry, influenced by fascist and nationalist propaganda, and welded together with generations born in the United States but ideologically part of the national group and in many instances giving leadership to these national groups.

The most important national groups and those upon which the Convention Resolution correctly states we shall concentrate, are the Germans, Italians, Jews, Poles, South Slavs and Spanish-speaking people. Another group should be added because of its importance in all phases of American life, and that is the Irish. Take only New York as an example. These seven groups in New York State represent about 45 per cent of the total population and even a higher percentage in the city of New York.

Let us look more intimately at a few of these groups. Take, for instance, the Germans in the United States. When Hitler came to power and raised the question of the Versailles Treaty and the right of Germany to a place in the world; when he raised the spirit of nationalism, the German-Americans, in large part taken in by his demagogy, also felt proud. They felt that Germany once again was coming forward as a great nation. When, however, Hitler followed this up with persecutions of the trade unions, of the Social-Democrats, Communists, Jews, Catholics and Protestants; when Hitler sent his legions and airplanes into Spain to destroy Spanish democracy and the Spanish Catholic people; when he invaded Austria and now when he threatens Czechoslovakia; when they saw Nazi spies working here to undermine our democracy, then pride in Germany began to change among the German-Americans. German-American nationalist and fascist leaders have tried to foster fascist ideas and national chauvinism. The result is a clean division and sharpening relations between the fascist-minded Germans and German-Americans—those adhering to Hitler and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the great bulk of German-Americans who are the supporters of democracy. The result is that in a large and very important German organization, the Steuben Society, steps recently were taken to change the constitution of the Society and divorce it completely from Nazism.

Or let us look at the Italians in the United States. When Mussolini expanded the Italian empire by invading Ethiopia and making Italy a greater world power, the Italian-Americans felt great pride because of the growth of Italy's empire. They felt that their importance in the United States grew with the expansion of the Italian realm. When, however, Mussolini invaded Spain, which not only brought about the slaughter of another Catholic people, the Spaniards, but also resulted in greater taxation, terror and persecution for the people of Italy, a change began among the Italian-Americans.

The same thing has developed among other national groups in the United States. The practice of the employers to pit the groups of one nationality against another, in order to exploit them all the more, threatened to assume national importance. National chauvinism became very sharp. This was taken advantage of by the reactionaries and fascist-minded people of the United States who tried to take power in the 1936 elections.

But the danger of reaction in the United States and the growing menace of fascism had its effect, and in the 1936 elections the great mass of the national groups went into the ranks of the democratic front. The crisis particularly affected the people of the national groups and threw millions of them out of employment. This raised the question, not only of unemployment, but of relief, jobs, housing, etc. They saw reactionary and fascist groups in the United States trying to solve the question of unemployment by raising the issue of foreigners and Catholics, in the spirit of the Ku Klux Klan; they heard the slogan of the American fascists that this country must become a "white Protestant America." Hence they realized the danger that confronted them in this country. This reaction has been sharpened in more recent times by the speeches of Roosevelt and Ickes against fascism abroad as well as in the United States.

The national groups have seen reactionary organizations in the United States pretending to be against fascism but at the same time giving material as well as ideological support to the war plans of the fascist aggressors. Present war developments in Europe, with Hitler threatening Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Jugoslavia and Poland, as part of his war plan against the Soviet Union, have caused a tremendous ferment among the national groups, to which they are reacting very sharply. A deep-seated feeling among the immigrants and the second, third and fourth generations is that a show-down is coming between the democracy that they love in the United States, and reaction and fascism on a national and international scale.

THE TASKS OF OUR PARTY IN THE FIELD OF NATIONAL GROUPS

The work of our Party has also been effective among the national groups. This has been particularly

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

true since we adopted a correct approach to the question. While raising the questions of unemployment, housing, the high cost of living, as well as the special issues affecting the national groups, such as civil rights, political representation, etc., we have related these questions with the problems of their home countries which are not disconnected from the problems in the United States. *Our aim, as always, is to unite the people on their economic, social and political needs, as opposed to the aims of the fascists, which are to divide the people.* It was this correct orientation that characterized the excellent election campaign of Comrade Krystalski in Hamtramck, Mich., of Comrade Cacchione in New York, and of Comrade Onda in Cleveland. It is a deepening of this understanding and correct application of approach and tactics that is necessary throughout the Party.

What organizational channels have we for carrying on this work? The most important is the trade union movement. The C.I.O. in particular has raised all the above-stated issues very sharply. These are the issues of the broadest masses of the people. It is the task of the progressives in the trade union movement to raise these issues sharply and to become the champions not only of the workers generally but of the national groups in particular in the trade union movement. In fact, the national groups can become a real factor for unity in the trade union movement.

Our comrades, on the other hand, do not always react properly. Take, for instance, the United Hebrew Trades in New York City. This organization is made up of representatives of trade unions which have a large Jewish membership.

Unions in which there is Communist and progressive leadership are affiliated to the United Hebrew Trades. But our comrades have the idea that the organization is reactionary and therefore do nothing to challenge the leadership in the organization. The result is that the organization is dominated by the reactionaries without dispute.

Furthermore, it operates not only in the trade union field, but among the Jewish people generally, with the result that the masses of workers in the unions affiliated are represented by people who do not reflect their ideas but speak in their name. In fact, this particular organization controls the Jewish Labor Committee, which has worked in a manner that prevents the unification of the Jewish people, so extremely important, particularly now at a time of ferocious anti-Semitism.

The deepening and widening crisis affects particularly the national groups. Hence it is our task to help strengthen the Workers Alliance. This can be another effective vehicle for drawing the national group people into the democratic front. It was with a correct understanding of this fact that in East Harlem, New York, where 200,000 Italians live, the Workers Alliance has served as an excellent medium for uniting the Italian people in a broad democratic front, in helping eliminate fascist influence.

In the trade union and unemployed movement there is grave danger of Trotskyism and Lovestoneism. These agencies of reaction operate greatly among the national groups. They Red-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bait, disrupt the work of the union, and do everything possible to undermine the influence of the Communists and progressives. These fascist agents and disrupters must be exposed and driven out of the movement.

Then there are other mass organizations such as the International Workers Order, all of whose 150,000 members, except perhaps 15,000, are members of national groups. Other organizations of similar character, like the German Sick and Death Benefit Fund, with 50,000 members; the Croatian Sick and Death Benefit Society with 50,000 members, the Workmen's Circle with an equal number of members, are all important organizations that can form a base for reaching important fraternal societies of other nationalities.

We have already had experience in building a broad united front movement on various issues. Take the movement that existed on unemployment insurance, which took on big dimensions among Italians and Czechoslovaks. These movements continued for quite a period and showed considerable vitality. They fell apart because other political issues were not raised. There are other issues that today come to the fore, especially as concerns the national groups. There is, pre-eminently, the war question which affects Italians, Germans, Czechs, Rumanians, Jews, etc. These national groups in the United States want peace, not war. A broad democratic front within each national group and among several national groups directly affected by the danger of war can be formed, and they can be drawn into the peace movement. Thus, the Rumanians and South Slavs, the Lithuanians, Esthonians and Finns all have an equal interest in the preservation of peace. The building up of a peace movement among these national groups can exert tremendous influence in the United States in the development of the peace organizations, especially the American League for Peace and Democracy, as well as in exerting pressure and influence upon the policies of their native countries.

Some progress has been made by a few of the national groups in the building of the movement for the democratic front. Recently the Hungarians held a very broad conference in support of the program of President Roosevelt. Roosevelt himself considered this conference important and sent a letter of greeting. There is a Greek Democratic Federation embracing large numbers of Grecks; a Ukrainian united front organization; a Czechoslovakian united front of very broad dimensions on the question of war; a Jewish People's Committee which has brought together large numbers of civic and fraternal Jewish organizations. But these are only the beginnings of what can and must be accomplished if the national groups are to play their due part in the building of the democratic front.

The women are a special question among the national groups. In many of these groups women are thrust into the background and have not the freedom of action that men have. For instance, Italian girls are not allowed to go out at night unless chaperoned by their mothers. Among many national groups women are denied in practice any participation in political life. On the other hand reactionary

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

politicians form all kinds of circles among women such as knitting circles, sewing clubs, etc., through which they influence the women. The church has a powerful hold upon the women. Coughlin influences particularly the women. This must be a warning to us against any lagging of our work among the women.

While we think of the second, third and fourth generations of the immigrants in this country as being absorbed into American life, we must not forget, as above indicated, that they are also essentially a part of the national group community and susceptible to nationalist propaganda. The reactionaries do not dare to bring forward their propaganda in a reactionary form, but disguise it with progressive slogans. Hence, work among the youth of the national groups is of tremendous importance. The Trotskyites and Lovestoneites make a special appeal to the youth on the basis of ultra-revolutionary slogans. The youth can be swung into the democratic front provided there is a correct approach to the national group problem.

In this respect, attention should be called to the World Youth Congress which will take place in this country in August and which will be attended by youth delegates from all countries. This will create broad interest among the youth as well as the adults of the national groups and can involve them in the activities of the Congress.

The masses of the four and one-half million Jews in this country are instinctively anti-fascist. They are the object of persecution, oppression and pogroms in all reactionary countries. Anti-Semitism is growing in this country. It is one of the weapons of obscurantism and reaction. It is a scourge on the body of progress and must be wiped out. Anti-Semitism is an old practice of the reactionaries and was especially identified with the policy and practice of the Russian tsars, who used it as a means of diverting the attention of the masses from the true source of their suffering, namely, feudalism and reaction, to the Jew as the scapegoat. This method has been adopted by the reactionaries and fascists who have developed it into a system, as witness Germany and Austria today.

As a result of these fascist activities, however, anti-Semitism is growing in Europe and is being transplanted into this country. The Ku Klux Klan, the Silver Shirts, the Crusaders, Father Coughlin, Henry Ford, and all fascist-minded individuals and organizations make anti-Semitism the center of their activity. Even among the Negroes the question of the Jews is being raised more and more frequently. Negroes are in direct contact with Jewish landlords and merchants who exploit the Negroes as do all landlords. As a result there is growing resentment against these Jewish landlords among the Negroes. This is generalized by Negro petty-bourgeois nationalists and white fascists into a struggle against the whole Jewish people.

It is our task to carry on the sharpest campaign against anti-Semitism everywhere and particularly among the national groups. In order, however, to carry on the struggle most effectively it is necessary to bring about united action of the united front Jewish organizations in the United States, namely, the American

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Jewish Congress, the American Jewish Committee, the B'nai Brith, the Jewish Labor Committee and the Jewish People's Committee. These Jewish organizations can play a significant part in the broad democratic front united with the other national groups in a progressive channel.*

In our work among the national groups we must bring forward the revolutionary *traditions* and *contributions* of the national groups to cultural and political life both here in the United States and in their home countries. Practically every national group in the United States has in some form or other done its part in the building of the life and culture of the United States. Every country has a national tradition of which every progressive can be proud. Our task is to link up these traditions with the progressive ideals of today and make them part of the whole struggle of the democratic front.

It is not well known that nine of the signers of the Declaration of Independence were Irish and Irish-Americans. It is not too well known that the development of Massachusetts is linked up with the whole struggle and participation of the Irish and Irish-Americans in Massachusetts. Thus every national group is tied up with the traditions of the United States which can become directly a part of the democratic front.

On the other hand we must be very careful *not to exaggerate these traditions with respect to any particular national group.* This would tend to a rivalry and distrust that would create not unity but division. This would be merely a reflection of the aims of the bourgeois nationalists and lead to a distortion of national pride.

Three million in the national groups are not yet citizens of this country. As a result these people suffer serious handicaps arising from non-citizenship. They must be assisted in becoming full-fledged citizens. We must also fight for the abrogation of the laws denying citizenship to Orientals, since this will materially aid in the struggle against reaction, of progress against fascism.

What is the situation within our Party in face of these tremendous problems? The national group bureaus are weak and sectarian. For a long time they have been made up of comrades speaking the particular language. The reorganization of the national groups should take place without delay. Steps in this direction have already been taken in the strengthening of the Italian national bureau. The National Committee strengthened it by attaching comrades working in the mass movement of the Italians as well as Italian comrades in the trade union movement. This should be done in every national and state bureau of the national groups.

What is the function of the national group bureau? Its task is to supply the Central Committee and the lower Party organizations with material on the social and political problems facing the respective national groups in

* Since this report was made at the Tenth National Convention, unity of action of the four first named organizations has been achieved, to the exclusion of the Jewish People's Committee. This is no doubt due to the sectarian line of the Socialists and progressives in the Jewish Labor Committee, as well as to insufficient work in the Jewish organizations generally and to inadequate broadening of the Jewish People's Committee.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this country as well as data regarding developments in the home country; and develop organizational steps to draw the national group people into the struggle for the democratic front on national and political questions; second, to help build and strengthen the Party and the united front press; and third, to help build the Party. These are tasks that the bureaus must perform, *not independently but as instruments of National and State Committees which directly are responsible for the work of the whole Party, including work among the national groups. No longer can this work be relegated to groups of comrades of a particular nationality working among the national groups. This is part of the work of the whole Party for which the respective Party committees must be directly responsible.*

It is the very relegation of this work to bureaus, to a great extent separated from the committees of the Party, insufficiently guided and checked, that is greatly responsible for the weakness of our work among the national groups. It is also due to the fact that there has been a lack of forces assigned by the Party for this phase of our work. The bureaus have the special task of reaching the people of the national group and for strengthening the press. Yet a very important united front paper, established some time ago as a daily, was allowed to decline merely because only a handful of comrades throughout the Party was assigned to assist the staff of the paper in promoting the sale and circulation. The result was a small circulation, and finally the change to a weekly.

If some time ago it could be said that we did not have forces to carry on this work, today it can no longer be said. These forces must be assigned for work. But this is not sufficient. They must be trained for their work. This has been done to some extent in New York by the selection of groups of Italian-American and Irish-American comrades to attend the state and county schools. This practice must be extended throughout the country if comrades are to be equipped for doing this important work among the national groups, for building the democratic front and building our Party.

We must assign comrades to join the big mass organizations, to build the circulation of the respective national group papers there, to raise the issues of the democratic front, and bring these organizations and their membership into the election campaign as part of the democratic front. In assigning comrades to these national group organizations, we should not spread out too far, but rather concentrate in the beginning on certain strategic organizations. While not discontinuing our work among the small Left-wing clubs and organizations, we must release many of the comrades now working in these small organizations for work in the larger, more authoritative organizations. These comrades must be orientated to a clear understanding of the composition of these organizations. They must be given a correct approach to the Catholics, so that we will be able to make allies of and win these people for the democratic front.

This will require the translation and production of *literature* for the national groups. Only a few bureaus have been able to issue literature. A

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

beginning must be made especially among the six national groups mentioned in the resolution for the production of a series of pamphlets on the vital questions facing the national groups in this country as well as on problems facing their people in the home country.

If, however, this is to be done, it is necessary that our comrades be not only *good Communists,* but *good Germans, good Jews, good Irishmen.* There is no contradiction in being a good Communist and a good Irishman. Just as Comrade Dimitroff declared that he was proud to be a Bulgarian, so, too, every Communist must be proud of that nationality to which he is bound by inseparable ties, and through his work and his conduct make of himself the outstanding representative of the best that his people has produced. Through the internationalism of the Communists, we will unite the national groups together with the so-called native-born Americans, the Yankees, in a real melting pot of progress and democracy, and for freedom.

CONCLUSION

Two important congresses will take place within a short time. As we have been informed, a Congress of Czechs and Slovaks for support of democracy in Czechoslovakia against Hitler will soon be held. This congress promises to embrace all the organizations of these nationalities. At the end of September or October a *Congress of Nations* is planned. As we understand, a provisional committee has already been set up to sponsor this congress. The purpose of this congress is to fight for democracy in this country, to aid the struggle for democracy in Central Europe and the Balkans, and to exert pressure on our government for collective security. Such a congress can have tremendous significance in the life of our country and can bring into united, progressive action a large portion of the forty to fifty million people who comprise the national groups of this country.

President Roosevelt, speaking before the convention of the Daughters of the American Revolution, declared that we are all descendants of immigrants and revolutionists. These immigrants and their descendants are also to be found in the national groups. The district and state organizations must consider work among the national groups as of first rate importance. They must supply the forces, guide the work, help build the press in the respective languages. If this work is done properly, we can swing millions of these people into the democratic front. If this is done, we will be able to build our Party as the leader of these powerful and, in many localities, decisive forces for the democratic front and for socialism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LOVESTONEISM—
TWIN OF FASCIST-TROTSKYISM

BY CARL REEVE

THE role of the Lovestoneite group as agents of fascism becomes clear in the light of the recent trials, at Moscow, of the twenty-one Trotskyite-Bukharinite wreckers and spies. Lovestoneism can no longer masquerade as "a political trend in the working class movement." Lovestoneism now finds it impossible any longer to maintain the fiction that it is "more respectable" than Trotskyism. The Lovestoneite group of renegades and disrupters is now identified with the Trotskyites, with identical reactionary aims and organizational cooperation.

The Lovestoneite group is the American offspring of the international "Right" group of counter-revolutionaries led by Bukharin in the Soviet Union. Just as the Trotskyites and Bukharinites merged in the Soviet Union in a bloc of "Right" and Trotskyist fascist spies and assassins, so in the United States the Trotskyites and Lovestoneites have merged as agents of fascism.

Jay Lovestone has always been the personal representative of Bukharin in the United States, just as Max Shachtman has been the American representative of Trotsky. Lovestone has always regarded Bukharin as his leader and throughout the years has been in the international bloc of the "Rights" led by Bukharin, fighting against the Communist International and against the Soviet Union.

As far back as January, 1934, in his report to the Seventeenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Comrade Stalin pointed out that the "Lefts" and the Rights (headed by Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsky) had united on a common platform for the overthrow of Soviet power and the restoration of capitalism. Stalin declared:

> "We have always said that the 'Lefts' are the Rights who mask their Right-ness with Left phrases. Now the 'Lefts' themselves confirm the correctness of our statement. Take last year's issues of the Trotskyite *Bulletin*. What do Messieurs the Trotskyites demand, what do they write about, in what does their 'Left' program express itself? They demand: *the dissolution of the Soviet farms* because they are unprofitable; *the dissolution of the majority of the collective farms* because they are fictitious; *the abandonment of the policy of liquidating the kulaks; reversion to the policy of concessions, and the leasing of a number of our industrial enterprises to concessionaires* because they are unprofitable.
>
> "Such is the program of the contemptible cowards and capitulators, a counter-revolutionary program of restoring capitalism in the U.S.S.R.!
>
> "In what way does it differ from the program of the extreme Rights? Clearly, it differs in no way. It follows then that the 'Lefts' have openly associated themselves

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with the counter-revolutionary program of the Rights in order to enter into a bloc with them and to wage a joint struggle against the Party." *

We now know that this bloc of Bukharinites and Trotskyites was at that time employed by the secret services of the fascists for wrecking, murder, and the dismemberment of the Soviet Union.

Comrade Stalin pointed out this fact, that the Bukharinites (Lovestoneites in the United States) and the Trotskyites had merged as agents of fascism, in his celebrated speech "Mastering Bolshevism," stating:

"It is now clear for all, I think, that the present-day wreckers and diversionists, no matter what flag they use to cover themselves with, the Trotskyite or Bukharin flag, have long ceased to be a political trend in the working class movement, that they have turned into a gang of professional wreckers, diversionists, spies and murderers, devoid of principles and ideas." **

Lovestone with his clique was expelled from the Communist Party in 1929, after he had openly begun to fight, under Bukharin's leadership, against Marxism-Leninism and against the Communist International. Lovestone was linked closely with the Brandler group in Germany and with other renegades expelled from the Communist International during that period. Comrade Wilhelm Pieck, in his report to the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International, in behalf of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, declared of the struggle of the Communist International against these Right elements, led by Bukharin, who was even then a fascist spy:

"The political and organizational consolidation of the Communist Parties was effected in the course of a struggle against the Right elements which were urging the Parties to capitulate to Social-Democracy. Soon after the Sixth World Congress the Rights began to oppose the line of the Congress; in Germany, in the case of *Brandler,* somewhat later in the U.S.A., *Lovestone;* in Czechoslovakia, *Jilek;* in Sweden, *Kilbom*; and in France, *Sellier* and later *Doriot.*" *

LOVESTONE AND BUKHARIN DEFEND AMERICAN IMPERIALISM

For some time previous to his expulsion, Lovestone had been propagating in the United States Bukharin's theory of "organized capitalism," glorifying American imperialism and declaring that it was impregnable. On the very eve of the 1929 crash, Lovestone declared that American imperialism was growing stronger. Corrected by the Communist International and by the whole American Party, Lovestone organized a small group to fight against the Party and the Communist International and to carry on disruptive work.

The Marxist-Leninist laws of the contradictions of capitalism, especially the general crisis of world capitalism, did not apply to the United States, according to Lovestone. In an article in *The Communist* for July, 1928, Lovestone said:

"American capitalism may have an economic situation of as much prosperity or

* *Socialism Victorious,* p. 76, International Publishers, New York.

** Report to the Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, March 3, 1937. See *Mastering Bolshevism,* International Publishers, New York.

* Wilhelm Pieck, *Freedom, Peace and Bread,* Workers Library Publishers, New York.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

even bigger prosperity than that of 1926-27. American national economy is not declining fundamentally. Quite the contrary, it is on the ascent."

This article set forth the idea that there was no possibility of developing struggles of the American workers because American imperialism was so strong.

Lovestone, claiming to see nothing but strength in the capitalist class and nothing but weakness in the working class, was trying to disarm and disrupt the Party. Just a few months before the big economic crash of 1929, he wrote in *The Communist* (February, 1929):

"The whole, the central point in the international situation is woven around the fact of the aggressive role of American imperialism growing out of its still ascending strength."

At the very time that Lovestone was glorifying American imperialism and slandering the fighting capacity of the American masses, Bukharin, his chief, was plotting in the Soviet Union with other counter-revolutionary elements for the restoration of capitalism.

Stalin, in his famous speech in the American Commission of the Communist International, in May, 1929, assailed the position of Lovestone-Bukharin and predicted the acute crisis in United States imperialism, which occurred only a few months later:

"Many now think that the general crisis of world capitalism will not affect America. That of course is untrue, comrades. The crisis of world capitalism is developing with increasing rapidity and cannot but affect American capitalism. The 3,000,000 now unemployed in America are the first swallows indicating the ripening of the economic crisis in America."

The Communist International, in the same year, attacked the Lovestone-Bukharin counter-revolutionary line in an address to the American Party:

"With a distinctness unprecedented in history, American capitalism is exhibiting now the effects of the inexorable laws of capitalist development, the laws of decline and downfall of capitalist society. The general crisis of capitalism is growing more rapidly than it may seem at first glance. The crisis will shake also the foundation of the power of American imperialism."

THE REACTIONARY PRACTICES OF THE LOVESTONE GROUP

Disruption in the unions. In every organization where the Lovestoneites manage to worm their way, they foster Red-baiting, disruptive, reactionary policies, and urge surrender to the bosses. The disruptive line of Lovestone in the United Auto Workers Union is the outstanding example of the strife that this small but poisonous group is stirring up wherever it can. In the auto union, Lovestone, securing influence over President Homer Martin, fostered factional strife through some elements in the so-called progressive group. Lovestone tried to imbue the Auto Workers officials with the idea that General Motors, Ford, and the other companies were so strong that substantial gains could not be made. He tried to demoralize the auto workers with his propaganda that under the present economic conditions the workers must accept whatever the companies are willing to grant.

It was due to Lovestone's pernicious influence on Martin and a couple of other officials that the recent agreement between the Auto Workers Union and the General Motors Cor-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

poration embodied a retreat, the union accepting worse terms than in the previous agreement. Under Lovestone's influence the Martin leadership gave in to General Motors, allowing it to have full discharge power in cases of "unauthorized" strikes. The Auto Workers in conference rejected this agreement; but Martin re-signed it in spite of their decision. Under Lovestone's influence, Martin has made several other retreats in regard to the struggle against grievances and recognition of the shop organization.

Martin has made hints from time to time of his willingness to accept a general wage cut. The leadership of Martin, in contrast to the other C.I.O. unions, shows the harmful effect of Lovestone's influence.* In other industries, such as steel, radio, etc., where the economic conditions are no better than in auto, the leaders of the C.I.O. unions have won improvements in recent negotiations with employers and held on to the gains they have made in former agreements. Martin, in slandering and lying about the Communists, who helped build the Auto Union, has shown himself to be irresponsible in serious situations, as in his babbling of a general strike in connection with the struggle of the auto workers in Canada, and displaying instability and unreliability.

Lovestone's stooge, William Munger, was shoved into an official position in the union, as editor of the union's paper. Lovestone secured the appointment of several others of his followers to key positions in the union, and they began spreading irresponsible statements and lies in the capitalist press, slandering the Communists and the unity group in the Auto Workers Union. It is significant that the reactionary press, which uses Lovestoneite-Trotskyite Red-baiters like Stolberg to slander and attack Lewis, Brophy, Bridges, and other C.I.O. leaders, at the same time praises and plays up Homer Martin. *Martin is the only leader of a C.I.O. union whom the Hearst press likes.*

One of the chief causes for the slowness in the organization of the Ford workers has been the fact that Lovestone's influence has held back the officials from a united and effective drive to organize the plant. Here again, Lovestone spread defeatism and pessimism, taking the position that the workers were not able to fight. Whenever the Auto Workers have had the chance to vote in elections and conventions, they have repudiated Lovestone's policies. It is the awareness of the rank and file which has prevented Lovestone, through his influence on Homer Martin, from inflicting even more damage on the Auto Workers Union.

The splitting tactics and factional activity of the Lovestoneites in the Auto Workers Union came more out into the open when Martin, violating the constitution of the union, arbitrarily declared a number of the members of the Executive Board and the union suspended from their offices, such people as Wyndham Mortimer and others who had played a large role in the founding and building of the Auto Union. Martin displayed a determination to take his factional

* The story of Lovestone's efforts in behalf of the motor companies is told by William Z. Foster in the March 28 issue of the *Daily Worker*.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

activity, inspired by Jay Lovestone, to the point of splitting and disrupting the national organization.

In a number of other unions (maritime, I.L.G.W.U., teachers, office workers), where Lovestoneites have crept in, they have formed factional groups, calling themselves "Progressive" to hide their disruptive purpose, and acting against militant C.I.O. and A. F. of L. leadership. On the West Coast, the Lovestoneites, together with the Trotskyites, have joined the hue and cry of the jailers of Tom Mooney, the ship owners and the Chamber of Commerce, against Harry Bridges, against the militant leadership of the C.I.O. and the Maritime Union. On the East Coast, they have joined a group of degenerate disrupters in a fight against the leadership of Curran and, with a "slate" including shady underworld elements, tried to oust the union leadership by raising the "Red scare." They did their best to discredit and destroy the Maritime Union and its progressive C.I.O. leadership, both on the West and East coasts. They encouraged the fascist cry for the deportation of the C.I.O. leader Harry Bridges.

The Lovestone group supports and encourages every Red-baiter and fascist agent. When Benjamin Stolberg came out with his attack on the C.I.O. in the Scripps-Howard papers, Lovestone's sheet, *The Workers' Age,* chimed in with the applause of big business and of all reactionaries. These were the articles which were used on the West Coast by the shipping interests in an attack on the marine unions, and which slandered Brophy, Quill, Bridges, and many other leaders of the C.I.O. in a most vicious manner.

LOVESTONE WORKS FOR FASCISM

In every country the Trotskyite-Bukharinite bloc carries out a policy which aids the fascist "anti-Comintern" pact. The Lovestoneites and Trotskyites are carrying out the policies and desires of the general staff of the Japanese armies and of Hitler and Mussolini. Whereas in Japan, the Trotskyite-Lovestoneite bloc works openly *with* the fascist-militarist general staff because it is endeavoring to provoke war against the Soviet Union, the same bloc of Trotskyites and Lovestoneites in the United States operates against the progressive Roosevelt administration because it is not lined up with the powers now preparing war against the Soviet Union.

A dispatch from China, cited by Harry Gannes, in a recent issue of the *Daily Worker,* states:

> "Nor do the Japanese rely on Chinese Trotskyites only. They have brought along with their army to Shanghai the well-known Trotskyite renegade from the Japanese Communist Party, Sato. He is attached to the General Headquarters Staff of the Japanese Army in the Hongkew district of Shanghai. Helping to direct the 'anti-Soviet Union' phase of Japan's propaganda, on the staff of the Konoye Cabinet in Tokio is a Trotskyite renegade."

In China the Trotskyite-Lovestoneite bloc formed the anti-Comintern brigade and have worked with the Japanese to stir up uprisings against the Chinese army. The Trotskyites staged a putsch, trying to seize power in Kwangsi province. The dispatch from China states:

> "Wang Kung-tu, former member of the Executive Committee of the Kwangsi Tangpu, was the chief Trotskyite agent. He used the occasion of Pai's absence in an effort to grab power. Wang, together with 100 of his

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conspirators, was arrested. He and 72 of his co-conspirators were tried and executed as pro-Japanese and Trotskyite agents."

In Spain, it has been proved by documents, Andreas Nin and the other Trotskyites and Lovestoneites of the P.O.U.M. were paid agents of Franco and were part of his fascist spying and wrecking apparatus. The counter-revolutionary insurrection at Barcelona last year led by the Trotskyite-Lovestoneite P.O.U.M. and other criminal and reactionary elements in behalf of Franco is well known. How completely Lovestone identifies himself with these fascist spies and agents in Spain is seen by his repeated plea for them in his sheet, *The Workers' Age*. In his slanderous pamphlet *The People's Front Illusion*, defending the fascist agents of the P.O.U.M. and seeking to disguise that Franco outfit as a "revolutionary group," he declares:

"A painfully crude appreciation of what the People's Front line leads to is to be found in the maneuvers of the Comintern section in Catalonia to exclude the P.O.U.M. from the government."

LOVESTONEITES FIGHT IN THE INTERESTS OF FASCIST WARMONGERS

In the United States the Lovestoneites, hand-in-glove with the Trotskyites, are propagating the policy of "isolation," the policy that aids the fascist wars of invasion against democratic Spain and China and against the democratic countries everywhere.

At the last convention of the American Students Union the Lovestoneites joined in with the Trotskyites in support of the Oxford Pledge, which fits in with the reactionary isolationist policy, as opposed to collective security. The twin agencies of fascism have tried to disrupt the unity of the students' fight for peace, and this disruptive activity culminated last April in the attempt to sabotage the students' strike for peace with counter-demonstrations in behalf of the policy favored for America by the fascist aggressor powers.

The Lovestoneites today are also backing the demand of Japan that the United States withdraw its ships from Chinese waters. The withdrawal of Standard Oil tankers, which are supplying China with much needed oil to carry on her fight for national independence, is a Lovestoneite demand which certainly has the backing of the Japanese war office.

The Lovestoneites and Trotskyites together with those who oppose collective action against fascism and war organized a conference on May 28 in Washington which claimed to be an "anti-war" congress. The Lovestoneites together with other isolationists dominated this conference, and although the rank-and-file delegates, who through confusion attended the congress, wanted to pass a resolution calling for lifting of the embargo on Spain, and for the boycott of Japanese goods, the Lovestoneites, led by such people as Bertram Wolfe and their whole group of national leaders of disruption, successfully sabotaged the passage of such a resolution. At this conference they formed a united front with their friend, Norman Thomas, and they boosted Homer Martin and others of his type as the "stars" of the conference. Their whole plan was to confuse honest pacifists and honest anti-war people, and to conduct a campaign together with Republican reactionaries against collective action

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the democratic countries and the peoples of the world to check fascism and war. One plank in their program directed against collective security called demagogically "for opposition to entangling alliances with one nation or bloc of nations for war under any name or pretense, but support for positive cooperation with all nations for disarmament and peace." In their speeches at this congress Lovestoneite spokesmen made it clear that they meant by this ambiguous sentence a Red-baiting campaign, a campaign for breaking up the unity of the peace movement, a campaign to sabotage aid to Spain and China and thus to help the fascists.

A FASCIST INTERNATIONAL AGENCY

That Lovestoneism has a well-rounded pro-fascist program, crudely disguised by pseudo-revolutionary phrases, was once more proved at the conference of Trotskyite and Lovestoneite groups held in Paris in February of this year. This conference had as delegates the scum thrown off by the labor movement of a number of countries. It included the fascist spies of the P.O.U.M., and an assortment of Trotskyite, Lovestoneite, and other renegades, wreckers and artists in espionage. Jay Lovestone represented the American branch of this international agency of fascism. *The Workers' Age* boasts of the fact that Lovestone helped to draft the principal resolution.

The P.O.U.M., which is acting as the Secret Service and "fifth column" of Franco in democratic Spain, had a large place at this conference. The delegate from the P.O.U.M. was the one who introduced the resolution on Spain. This Franco agent, Sogas, called for an immediate counter-revolution in Spain to overthrow the heroic People's Front. This was of course covered up by appropriate phrases about "the immediate formation of a genuine Workers' and Peasants' Government." The resolution passed by these agents of Hitler, Mussolini, and Franco endorsed "without reserve" all the policies and activities of the P.O.U.M.

The fascist aims of these stool-pigeon elements are revealed in the published speeches and in the resolution on Spain, which contain not the slightest reference to the activity of Hitler and Mussolini in Spain. The entire resolution is directed against the People's Front government of France, against democratic Spain, and against the Soviet Union. The resolution on the Soviet Union and the speech of a Hitler agent named Franz, introducing the resolution, bear out the purpose of the participants to act as the agents of fascism in trying to bring about the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union. They call for a counter-revolution in the Soviet Union, declaring:

> "The Soviet organs of the working class and of the government have been destroyed. . . . The working class has ceased to be a governing power."

Under the slogan, "Withhold working class support from Stalin," they call for aid to the attack of the fascist powers on the Soviet Union.

The main resolution, drafted by Lovestone, favors the disruption of the Second International and the Communist International, opposes a united front between the two Internationals, opposes the People's Front in France

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and Spain, denounces the Soviet Union, and says not a single word against fascist Japan, Italy, or Germany, or their war policy. The resolution disposes of Spain in the single demagogic slogan: "Defense of the social revolution in Spain, and of P.O.U.M. as its leader!" It calls for the unity of all anti-Marxian elements and all degenerated fascist spy elements in a "new International," to be composed of Trotskyites, Lovestoneites, uncontrollable elements in the Anarcho-Syndicalist movement, and "anti-Stalinists."

The resolution on the People's Front also urges upon these spies to enter the People's Front movement in order to smash it by carrying on "profound criticism." The whole discussion and resolution on the war situation were aimed against the democratic countries and against the Soviet Union and toward facilitating the war plans of the fascist powers against the Soviet Union. Thus, one of the speakers declared:

> "The proletariat, even of a capitalist state allied to a workers' state, must not relinquish the right to use the weapon of revolutionary defeatism in case of a war against the Soviet Union."

The resolution on China gives support to the Japanese war plans by denouncing the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese government and calling for the overthrow of the Chinese National Defense government.

LOVESTONEITES AID REACTION IN ELECTIONS

With the anti-Marxian "theory" that the workers should not make any alliance with the middle class, invented to further the aims of reaction and fascism, the Lovestoneites, in the Detroit elections last fall, used their influence with the Martin group in the Auto Workers Union to foster a narrow policy upon the labor forces, which was a primary cause for the defeat of labor in the elections and the victory of the reactionary candidates; whereas in New York, because of the broad character of the American Labor Party campaign, a signal victory was won by the labor forces.

In the recent Pennsylvania primary campaign, the Lovestoneites attempted to disrupt the campaign of the labor and New Deal elements around the Kennedy slate, on the pretext of attacking Mayor Wilson, one of the candidates on the Thomas Kennedy slate in the Democratic primaries, and used "revolutionary" phrases, claiming the slate to be opportunistic. They worked to insure the defeat of the Kennedy slate, and to foster encouragement to the reactionary Republicans. In the trade union movement of Pennsylvania, the Lovestoneites sabotaged and attacked the campaign of Kennedy and the C.I.O. to secure the nomination for governor and other state offices in the Democratic primary on an anti-fascist and progressive program. In this they have been following their procedure in the Illinois elections, where they also aided reaction by attacking and sabotaging the candidates of Labor's Non-Partisan League and the progressive forces.

LOVESTONEITES AMONG THE SOCIALISTS

Throughout the country, the Lovestoneites are more and more open in their organizational link with the Trotskyites. Is Herbert Zam a Trotskyite or a Lovestoneite? For many

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

years he has been the closest co-worker of Jay Lovestone in the anti-Soviet, anti-working class activity of the Lovestone group. At the same time he is the closest co-worker of the Trotskyites. He masquerades in Philadelphia as organizer of the Socialist Party. His organizing work for the Socialist Party consists of collaboration with every anti-Soviet, reactionary, degenerate, declassed, Red-baiting element who will listen to him. In the state of Pennsylvania the Socialist Party is already greatly weakened by the disruptive activities of such Trotskyites and Lovestoneites as Zam, Heckman in Allentown, and others.

Jack Stachel, in the April 29 issue of the *Daily Worker,* thus describes the rapprochement of certain elements in the Socialist Party and the Lovestoneites:

"Worst still, there are evidences that Norman Thomas, after the experience with the official Trotskyites, is now moving for some forms of collaboration with the Lovestone brand of the Trotskyites. They have found common ground on a growing number of issues, such as support for the counter-revolutionary Trotskyite P.O.U.M. in Spain; slander of the U.S.S.R.; fight against the movement to unite the people for peace through collective resistance to the aggressors; sabotage of the growing progressive movement and Labor's Non-Partisan League on the political field; joint fight against the Communists and genuine progressives in the trade unions. Is this to result in marriage between Thomas and Lovestone? We shall see. There is also a growing working together of the Lovestoneites and sections of the 'old guard.'"

This friendly relation is seen in Philadelphia where David Felix, chairman of the Socialist Party, works closely together with the Trotskyite-Lovestoneite Zam, on a program as outlined above, and where the dual Young People's Socialist League (which is affiliated to the so-called "Fourth" International!) a degenerated Trotskyite group, spends all its time trying to disrupt the American Student Union and other youth organizations. It is necessary for us to win away from such Trotskyite-Lovestoneite elements as Zam the genuine Socialists remaining in the Socialist Party.

DISRUPTIVE, FACTIONAL METHODS

It will be seen from all this that the method of Lovestoneism, like the method of Trotskyism, is sabotage and disruption. Like all renegade counter-revolutionary groups, the Lovestoneite group, wherever it can get a foothold, organizes a disruptive, factional clique and operates with a counter-revolutionary organization of its own, used against progressive leadership. Lovestone began this factional method while still a member of the Communist Party. It was not until the Party expelled Lovestone that it was able to eliminate factional groupings which placed the careerist interests of the faction above the interests of the Party and the working class. Since the expulsion of Lovestone and his clique, the Party, with a unified leadership supported by the entire membership, has grown to a mass Party of 75,000 members, unified behind the principles of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, a leading factor in great mass struggles and mass movements.

VIGILANCE NECESSARY

Does the Party need to be vigilant against the disruptive activity of this small group of Lovestoneite and Trot-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

skyite renegades? Let us remember the words of Comrade Stalin, in his great speech "Mastering Bolshevism," which sounded the warning that we must cast aside the rotten theory that because the Bolsheviks are many and the Trotskyites few, "we Bolsheviks can afford to pay no attention to such a handful of wreckers." Comrade Stalin warns: "It does not at all need a big number of people to do harm and to cause damage."

It takes a few Lovestoneites and Trotskyites to cause disruption and strife and confusion in the Workers Alliance, in the student movement and among peace groups, or in the trade unions. As Comrade Stalin points out, the Lovestoneites and Trotskyites have reserves. In the United States they can and do readily secure backing and support from reactionary big business which they serve. They secure recruits from a certain number of petty bourgeois intellectual elements whom they poison and confuse, and from others who have had no experience in the class struggle or connections with the labor movement.

LOVESTONEITES ARE ENEMIES OF ALL PROGRESSIVES

The problem of combatting these fascist agents is not a problem of the Communists alone. The Lovestoneites and Trotskyites are enemies of the entire labor movement, of all progressive forces, of those who desire peace, social security and democracy. The Lovestoneites and the Trotskyites must be driven out of the labor movement. They are enemies of the C.I.O. and A. F. of L.; they are enemies of trade union unity, and the trade union movement must throw off these Lovestoneite and Trotskyite elements in order to be in a healthy condition. The youth, in order to win their demands and build a strong youth movement, must eliminate the Lovestoneites and Trotskyites who are trying to creep into that movement to spread chaos and confusion and to split the youth organizations. Those who desire peace, the organizations committed to the struggle for peace and democracy, have got to get rid of the Lovestoneite and Trotskyite smugglers of reactionary ideas into the peace movement.

DEMAGOGIC PHRASES OF LOVESTONEISM

One of the tasks necessary to eliminate these wreckers is to expose their demagogic use of revolutionary phrases. Their service to the fascists is that they cloak their reactionary purposes behind revolutionary phrasemongering. Having the same program as the Hearsts and Landons, they try to fool the workers with radical-sounding words. Like Hearst, they oppose the People's Front, they want to overturn the Soviet government and restore capitalism, they want to keep the workers from securing the victory of progressive slates in the elections, they want to effect a war policy of isolation and freedom for the war plans of the fascists, they engage in Red-baiting and do not have to their credit one single constructive act. With cynical insolence they put forward this fascist program, claiming it to be "a revolutionary program," "a Marxist-Leninist program."

In fighting against the Trotskyites and Lovestoneites, we should bear in mind the advice of Comrade Stalin in "Mastering Bolshevism," of the necessity of raising the whole political level

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of our Party, particularly of our newer members, of explaining to them the counter-revolutionary past of the Trotskyite and Lovestoneite wreckers. By raising the political level of our Party, by giving more attention to the training of our forces, we shall be able to lead the broad democratic front movement, to develop successfully the struggles of the workers, and thus prevent the Trotskyites and Lovestoneites from sowing demoralization. In the interest of security, democracy, and peace, let us drive the Lovestoneites and Trotskyites out of the labor movement.

BROWDER ON *THE COMMUNIST*

". . . In every case where *The Communist* is not systematically used for the systematic education of our cadres, I can promise you that you are going to have trouble in your district. You are leaving your leading cadres unarmed in face of the pressing problems around us. The only possible way to meet and overcome our enemies on the ideological field is by the systematic study and reading of *The Communist*."—Earl Browder at the Enlarged Meeting of the Political Bureau, November, 1937.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HAS THE CRISIS RUN ITS COURSE?

BY GEORGE BRAHNS

THE sudden flare-up on the Stock Exchange makes some people believe and some others spread the idea that "recovery is around the corner." What is needed now, they suggest, is only a little bit of cooperation between government, capital and labor. It looks very much like a maneuver.

First of all, sudden movements of the stock exchange are, of course, by no means a conclusive proof or even a barometer of an impending revival of business activity in general. The Stock Exchange does not only reflect—as is widely held—"the psychology of capital" but is more often than not an instrument of resounding capitalist propaganda. Caution is in order. For the "bullish" expectation of a "collaboration between government, capital and labor" presages wage cuts on a wide scale.

The causes for the stir on the Stock Exchange may be the anticipation of the effects of the spending-lending program of the Roosevelt Administration, decreasing inventories, the persistent rumor of a further devaluation of the dollar and a pre-election maneuver on the side of the finance oligarchy to demonstrate their "good will" in order to raise the demand for "concessions" on the part of labor.

Yet all the data of production, circulation and consumption speak a different language. They tell of the persistence of the crisis. The Department of Commerce reports:

"Available data on industrial output indicate no significant change from the level maintained during the first half of June. Aggregate output for the month apparently showed little change from May after allowance for seasonal declines. During May industrial production according to the seasonally adjusted index of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System was 76 per cent of the 1923-25 average as compared with 77 per cent in April. In the automobile industry the curtailment of assemblies so far in June has exceeded the usual seasonal decline. One of the leading producers has announced that its summer shutdowns for model changes will be longer this year than usual. . . .

"Employment in manufacturing industries declined more than seasonally during May, the adjusted index receding 1.6 points to 77.6 (1923-25 = 100). As compared with a year ago factory employment is off about one-fourth. Factory payrolls also declined from April to May and were one-third lower than a year earlier." (*Survey of Current Business*, June 30, 1938.)

The monthly bulletin of the Federal Reserve Board gives the statistical data shown in the Business Indices Table on the following page.

The question is whether or not the economic downswing touched the bottom, whether we witness the transition from crisis to stagnation in the cycle. The facts do not justify any such definite conclusion at this time.

Prior to the announcement of Roosevelt's recovery program the in-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BUSINESS INDICES (1923-25 average = 100)

	Adjusted for Seasonal Variation		
	May, 1938	*April, 1938*	*May, 1937*
Industrial Production—total	76	77	118
Manufactures	73	73	118
Minerals	94	101	117
Construction contracts, value—total	51	52	56
Residential	37	37	44
All other	63	65	66
Factory employment—total	76.6	79.2	102.2
Durable goods	67.4	69.3	98.4
Non-durable goods	88.6	89.9	106.2
Factory payrolls—total*	69.4	70.7	105.2
Durable goods*	60.9	61.8	107.5
Non-durable goods*	80.3	82	102.3
Freight-car loadings	58	57	80
Department store sales, value	79	83	93
Department store stocks, value	69	69	76

* Without seasonal adjustment.

fluences making for a seasonal improvement were offset by the further deepening of the crisis. The sabotage of the monopolists threatened to bring about an economic collapse in the summer. The proposed extension of the period of shut-down of the automobile plants was one conspicuous sign of this headlong drive. Roosevelt's Recovery Program was introduced with the purpose of obviating such a development.

THE IMPACT OF THE RECOVERY PROGRAM ON THE CYCLE

This program managed to arrest—to a certain degree at least—the deepening and acceleration of the crisis. Yet it is inadequate wholly to counteract the forces making for a further sharpening of the crisis.

Almost the only tangible and immediately effective results will be brought about by the W.P.A. allotments of $200,000,000 monthly over the next eight months. This is $50,000,000 more monthly than was spent in either May or June this year. Still it is woefully inadequate really to counteract the shrinking of the purchasing power brought about by the crisis. As regards its effects in overcoming the crisis it is a drop in the bucket.

The same holds true, even to a higher extent, for the $212,000,000 parity payments for the farmers.

AGRICULTURAL INCOME
(in million dollars)

	Income from Marketings	*Government Payments*	*Total*
April:			
1938	489	60	549
1937	583	63	646
March:			
1938	512	60	572
1937	596	112	708

(*Agricultural Situation*, June, 1938.)

It can be easily ascertained at the first glance that the losses in agricultural income in consequence of the combined effect of price decline and shrinking consumer demand in only two months by far outweigh the allocated sum for parity payments.

As far as the stimulation of the heavy industries is concerned, the prospects are even less promising.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The $965,000,000 for the P.W.A. does not serve as an *additional* expenditure on construction; it is offset by the further decline of private construction.

"Private construction contracts, moreover, have taken a turn for the worse, so that if there is no reversal of present trends public construction will merely displace private to a certain extent.

"According to *The Engineering News Record* figures, the average of weekly private engineering contracts in June was the lowest since August, 1936. Public contracts were slightly lower. As a result, our three months moving average has shown a decrease.

"This turn for the worse in the construction industry, which contrasts strikingly with the situation throughout the spring when the building industry seemed to be an exception to the general industrial curtailment, is also reflected in the F. W. Dodge figures for the first half of June." (*Annalist*, July 1, 1938.)

The $800,000,000 subsidies for low-rent housing (of which by now only the additional $300,000,000 is available) cannot even scratch the surface of the housing problem in view of the present income structure, high rents, and high construction material prices.* Let us state for illustration's sake the following facts:

In the extremely biased and distorted computation of the cost of living index of the National Industrial Conference Board the "relative importance" of the item of housing "in the post-war family budget" is taken to be 20 per cent. What does this "average" hide? It disguises the misery of that third of the nation which is ill-housed, ill-fed and ill-clad. Yet economists and housing experts take it for granted almost unanimously that housing needs and potential demand exist on a large scale only for these lower income brackets.

In a very illuminating statistical study of the Department of Labor, "Consumption Habits of the American People" (*Monthly Labor Review*, March, 1938), the rent as per cent of family income is broken down into the different income groups. Then it turns out that in large cities the rent for families with incomes under $500 is 50 to 80 per cent of the family income. With increasing incomes the proportion is gradually leveled down until it reaches 15 and 13 per cent for the income groups $5,000 and over. This problem cannot be tackled with comparatively small appropriations and subsidies such as those foreseen in the recovery program.

To sum up: the recovery program is bolstering temporarily the tottering structure of mass purchasing power, but its impact on the chances for recovery is necessarily very limited. In other words, were we at the turning point of the cycle, then the Recovery Program of Roosevelt would serve undoubtedly as an effective fillip. But failing this, Roosevelt's Recovery Program cannot reverse the downward trend, cannot unleash an upswing. The timing of this program is not corresponding to the turning point in the cycle but is rather dictated by the pressing necessity of forestalling a collapse by bolstering the purchasing power.

* Cement prices were raised in July, 1938, by 17 to 50 cents a barrel! This at the same time when private construction decreased. Monopoly capital not only counteracts the Recovery Program by sabotaging private construction but pockets additional profits from public works by raising the prices for construction material.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE BURDEN OF THE CRISIS AND THE CHANCES FOR RECOVERY

The deepest point of the crisis is, of course, as long as it is not reached, hypothetical, a matter of conjecture. If, for instance, production would fall to the level of the deepest point of the previous crisis, 1932 (it did in some branches of industry)., that would be disastrous enough. But the possibility exists that the present crisis may surpass the record of the previous crisis in the decrease of production and the dwindling of mass purchasing power.

Since the last crisis the productivity of labor was increased by all sorts of "labor-saving devices," rationalization and speed-up. The increase in the output per man-hour in 1936 as compared with 1932 was in all manufacturing industries 14 per cent; blast furnaces, steel works and rolling mills 31 per cent; automobiles 38 per cent; cement 21 per cent; cotton 21 per cent; woolen and worsted goods 40 per cent; cigars and cigarettes 58 per cent; petroleum refining 27 per cent; rubber tires and inner tubes 16 per cent; anthracite mining 31 per cent; bituminous coal mining 13 per cent; crude petroleum mining 35 per cent; Class I steam railroads 27 per cent. ("Labor in Depression and Recovery, 1929 to 1937," *Monthly Labor Review,* Nov., 1937, p. 1066.)

These figures furnish the background for the sabotage of Big Business and real explanation (a) for the fact that the onslaught of the crisis occurred before recovery developed into a full-fledged boom; (b) that in the whole course of recovery payrolls never approached the level of 1929 though profits did; (c) that unemployment in the present crisis is already as big as in the previous one in spite of the fact that production did not yet reach the bottom of the previous one. Facts that augur ill for the present cyclical prospects.

One thing, however, is certain. *The deepest point of the crisis, wherever it may lie, is the one from which present-day monopolistic economy cannot lift itself automatically.* The deepest point is not necessarily the turning point as it was the case in normal capitalism. This was the great lesson taught by the crisis through 1932-33, and Roosevelt's New Deal was nothing but realizing that fact.

The efforts of the Roosevelt Administration are directed, therefore, to the end of halting the downward trend before it reaches the deepest point, *i.e.,* before it is "too late." What we contest is only that the amounts are sufficient and the methods adequate to achieve this end.

We dealt already with the major items of the Recovery Program; let us turn now to some of its methods.

The plight of the railroads is the greatest snag to recovery. A great number of lines are on the verge of bankruptcy or already in actual receivership. Now it is clear that without solving the problem of the railroads there cannot be a real turn for the better. In the nineteenth century the railroads were in a literal sense of the word the trail-blazers for the expansion and full development of capitalism, not only in the United States but in every other capitalist country. This was at the same time the prime of capitalist gambling and speculation. The speculation served the end of a far-reaching centralization of capital. The point, however,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is that at this time, in the period of capitalism in the upgrade, speculation was not entirely incompatible with the expansion of production, served even as a lever for the expansion of production. The merging of bank capital and industrial capital into finance capital on a grand scale occurred first in this sphere. The railroads with their credit mechanism were highly instrumental in the "creation of the market," in rendering possible the outstripping of the consumption capacity of capitalist society by its production capacity.

Things changed drastically in the post-war period of decaying capitalism. The speculation factor got the upper hand and is no longer compatible with production. The railroads became to an intolerably high degree the object of speculation. It is no longer accumulation, investment, production that matter, but buying and selling, manipulation of watered fictitious capital. With all that the railroads no longer contribute to the progress and expansion of the economy but only to its disintegration and decay. The hour of their nationalization has struck.

To come back to the methods of the Recovery Program. It foresees the granting of loans to the railroads, provided they are not in bankruptcy. This reservation is clearly of the utmost importance. Yet the actual practice of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is not strictly in accordance with this regulation. They blink an eye in endorsing loans to railroads which are in evident bankruptcy. This is not curing or fighting but fostering the evil. This sort of collaboration between bankrupt Big Business and government is utterly dangerous to democracy. After the experiences of the first New Deal it certainly cannot be the intention of the Roosevelt Administration to lend a hand to such practices, inherently futile in their economic effects and inimical to the interests of democracy.

The reservations for the granting of loans should be (and the Administration should stick to them): strict enforcement of reorganization of the financial structure with squeezing out of the watered capital, with due regard to small investors; the obligation to invest the money in repairs and purchase of rolling material*; reemployment of railroad workers and no wage cuts.

Similar, in this respect, are the methods applied to the public utilities. The Administration is ready to buy out those utilities which cannot successfully compete with the T.V.A. There is a haggling and bickering going on about the "fair price" to be paid to these bankrupt parasites who strike a lucrative bargain out of their bankruptcy. This is no solution of the problem.

Under such initial conditions the progressive Roosevelt Administration is no match for the powerful reactionary monopolies. If the collaboration between business and government means the bolstering of the power of the monopolies, the government and, of course, the people will be the losing partners in the game. To get a glimpse of the accumulated wealth

* The Interstate Commerce Commission reports a decrease of employment in the railroads in the middle of June compared with June, 1937, by 31.1 per cent in the departments of maintenance of equipment and stores, and 28.5 per cent in the maintenance of way and structures.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and power of these monopolies let us quote the following part of their report of the Federal Communications Commission on the American Telephone and Telegraph Companies:

"These companies, plus the Bell System, represented total consolidated net assets of over $44,000,000,000. The amount includes, in addition to 90 per cent of the telephone assets of the country, $11,700,000,000, or approximately 20 per cent of the banking assets; $11,000,000,000, or approximately 41 per cent of all insurance assets, and nearly $5,500,000,000, or approximately 18 per cent of the steam railroads in the United States."

The situation is clear. To say we are witnessing economically the turning of the tide is misleading and far from being corroborated by the facts. It is more correct to say we are in a spell before the storm, we are before an acute sharpening of the conflict between the monopolies and the people. The present truce and the solicitude for collaboration are nothing but an intermission in the warfare finance oligarchy wages against democracy and the living conditions of the masses. It is a brief lull to dig themselves in the better.

Their main strategic objective right now is the forcing down of the wage level. There is no recovery *for them* as long as this is not achieved. There is no giving up their economic and political sabotage. And that means inevitably a further sharpening of the crisis.

They speak of an impending wage cut in the steel industry already brazenly as an accomplished fact. They make no bones about it that this wage cut is going to be only a forerunner of wage cuts in the railroads and in many other lines of industry.

"There are numerous possibilities, but the most important, so far as the immediate future is concerned, is a readjustment in steel wage rates, which would be a complicated matter politically, but would clear the air economically not only because of its direct effects but also because of its indirect influence on similar situations elsewhere, particularly on the railroads." (*Annalist*, July 6, 1938.)

The slight reduction in steel prices resulting from the abolition of the "plus basing point principle" was nothing but a strategic move of Big Steel in competition against the Independents and in the first line a strategic move against the workers for preparing the wage cuts.

These wage cuts, if and when they come off, if the working class would not succeed in warding them off, would annul with a single stroke all the increase in the purchasing power accruing from the Recovery Program. It would lead inevitably to a further shrinking of the purchasing power. A Recovery Program with no effective guards against wage cuts is self-defeating.

As Comrade Bittelman showed in his brilliant analysis in the July issue of *The Communist*, the question is not one of normal or abnormal recovery but of who should bear the burden of the crisis—monopoly capital or the people?

Therefore, against the hideous "recovery" plans of the fascist-minded plutocrats we raise the Recovery Program of the people united in the democratic front. No wage cuts; jobs or adequate relief; public works on a large scale, financed by taxing the rich. This is the only way out of the crisis—of course, *not* for the Sixty Families but *for the American people*.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WITH UNITY WE SHALL CONQUER!*

BY JOSE DIAZ
General Secretary, Communist Party of Spain

DEAR COMRADES: My state of health prevents me from taking part in the work of this meeting of our Central Committee. Nevertheless, I am with you in spirit, I am with you heart and soul.

Our great comrade Dolores will have already set forth to you the tasks with which the present situation, owing to its extreme seriousness, confronts our Party and the Spanish people.

I should like to add, or rather to emphasize still more, a fundamental idea: that of the responsibility which our Party has at the present moment to the whole people. This responsibility is much greater today than it has ever been in the whole course of the war. Why? Because today the situation is the most serious that we have had since July 19, 1936. Because our Party is numerically greater, because it is stronger than it has ever been. Because in some spheres—especially when we take into account the tremendous possibilities of joint work with the Socialist Party—we are today the greatest, the most united and disciplined political force in the whole of Spain. And because, in addition, we are a most important constituent part of the Communist world movement, this powerful army of fighters for freedom, for peace, for socialism, which raises its battle flags in all parts of the world.

For all these reasons the Spanish people look to us today and expect much of us. Our responsibility is a historical fact which is connected with the development of our democratic revolution and the war, with the development of the whole history of our people; it is an immediate result of the fact that today there falls to the working class of Spain the task of leading the whole people in the fight in defense of national independence and of the democratic republic.

It is necessary that our Central Committee and all officials of the Party should clearly understand what this responsibility means, in practice, concretely.

It not only means that there is no question concerning our people which does not interest our Party; it not only means that we know and understand the needs of the workers, the peasants, the working petty bourgeoisie, the women, the youth and must work so that these needs shall be satisfied; it means not only that we must help in the solution of all questions of organizing the army and the economic life of our country at

* Letter to the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Spain, held May 23, 24 and 25, 1938.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this moment which is so difficult, but it means above and beyond all that we must see in the development and strength of our Party a greater possibility offered to us of rendering more fruitful our work for the unity of all anti-fascist forces, all democratic and revolutionary forces of Spain.

I know that in some periods of the war the rapid and impressive development of the Communist Party called forth some misgivings and a certain uneasiness. I know also that one of the weapons which the enemies of our people used, and still use, in order to mislead and demoralize a part of the masses and even of the leaders of the country, consists in sowing mistrust and suspicion and even hatred against the Communist movement.

These anti-Communist tendencies, which exist not only in our country but also abroad, are one of the most serious obstacles in the way of the mobilizing and the consistent fight of the whole of the united people for its liberties and for national independence against aggressive fascism.

As the Communists are the staunchest, most consistent fighters among the masses for liberty, independence, and unity, to isolate the Communists from the people means to weaken the whole front of the anti-fascist fight. The more rapidly these tendencies are eliminated in all anti-fascist sectors, the easier it will be to solve our questions and to achieve victory. We will facilitate this liquidation by making clear to everybody, by a correct policy and by daily work for unity, that the Communists have no interests apart from the general interests of the people and the nation. Our greatest pride consists in the fact that we are the most zealous defenders of unity—of unity in regard to war aims and in the practical work to solve the questions of the army, of supplying the needs of the civil population and of organizing the war industry—these three decisive questions of the day. Unity must at the same time serve in order to pursue a firm policy in regard to the war and of mobilizing all resources of the country to defeat all enemies of the people.

To nullify and then completely and permanently liquidate the disunity in the anti-fascist camp and also the particularist parish-pump, personal tendencies, which are a part of the accursed heritage left by the reactionary classes, who for centuries hindered the political, economic, and social development of the Spanish people—that is what is needed in order to win the war, to ensure that a fundamental change in the political life of Spain takes place and that our country, as soon as it has saved its independence and overcome the fascist danger, shall develop along the path of political and social progress.

Our people fully realizes that this is the task of the present day. And the reason why it looks to our Party with so much sympathy is because it could prove that we always were and continue to be *the party of unity*.

There is no doubt that the advance to the unity of the people and victory would be much quicker and surer if we succeeded, by amalgamating with the Socialists, in creating the united party of the proletariat. Our Party is a branch which has sprung from the trunk of the great Spanish labor movement, and its amalgamation with the Socialist Party would give the pro-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

letariat an authority and a power such as it has never had. As long as this aim has not been achieved—and it is necessary to work strenuously in order that it soon will be achieved—our action must always and in all fields proceed in unison with that of the Socialists.

I call upon you to examine attentively what are the causes which could stand in the way of the strengthening of this unity, and to remove them. The unity of Communists and Socialists, allied with Republicans and Anarchists, is the mainstay of the People's Front. Therefore, the Central Committee and all officials of the Party must spare no effort in order that this unity shall become closer and stronger every day. In this manner we shall be able to point the way to the working class of other capitalist countries in Europe, in which it is so necessary that a greater unity of the proletariat exist, in order to bar the path to the advance of the enemies of the people.

Unity has rendered possible our resistance.

With unity we shall conquer.

By its firm policy of unity the Communist Party must and will be the decisive factor making for victory.

Your comrade,

JOSE DIAZ.

August Selection of the Marxist Book-of-the-Month Club

The key book in the 1938 elections!

THE PERIL OF FASCISM

THE CRISIS OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

BY A. B. MAGIL AND HENRY STEVENS

320 Pages Price $2.00

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FROM THE WORLD COMMUNIST PRESS

DECLARATION OF THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY TO THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE PEOPLE'S ASSEMBLY

l'Humanité, Paris, June 23, 1938

In its last session, May 27 and 28, the Central Committee of the Communist Party pointed out emphatically that French policy is getting further and further away from the program of the People's Assembly.

Neither the increased taxes affecting the small taxpayers, nor the successive devaluations, the consequences of which fall heavily on the people, agree with the program of the People's Front, which, on the contrary, provides for "examination of trading in the war market, democratic reform of the system of taxation by measures hitting the great fortunes, validation of the fiscal 'letter of indication' voted as long ago as December 23, 1933, control of flights of capital, and suppression of efforts to evade such control."

It is certain that if these various measures were taken the state would have at its disposal financial resources which would permit it, without any difficulty, to give a sufficient pension to aged workers, and it would likewise be in a position to give satisfaction to:

The functionaries, retired workers, and workers in the civil service, who demand adjustment of pay and pensions;

The unemployed, who demand work and the immediate increase of their notoriously insufficient unemployment doles;

The peasants, who expect the creation of a fund to insure them against agricultural calamities and who are impatient at the long delay in voting on the agricultural bills in the Senate;

The business men, who are still waiting for the release of credits promised by the program, and who would like to see the Senate actually vote on the much mooted regulation of commercial property.

* * *

Failure to accomplish all this is due directly to the constant and increasing departure from the policy fixed by the program common to the parties and organizations of the People's Front. An example of this attitude is the complaisance with which those in power permit the attack of the big employers on the forty-hour week in the face of growing unemployment, partial and complete.

Furthermore, it cannot be forgotten that while the program of the People's Front provides for "the disarmament and effective dissolution of private military forces as the law requires," and "the enforcement of the legal provisions in case of provocation to murder or of assault on the safety of the state," yet the Cagoulards are set

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

free one after the other, and the authorities have tolerated the reorganization of the fascist leagues.

It must be added that the program of the People's Front in regard to the defense of peace provides for "international collaboration within the framework of the League of Nations for collective security by naming the aggressor and by the automatic and unified application of sanctions in case of aggression."

Instead of applying a foreign policy in conformity with this program we have seen, for nearly two years, the application, under the guise of "non-intervention," of a policy of encouragement to the German and Italian aggressors on Spain, while the legal government of that country is the victim of a scandalous and intolerable blockade.

* * *

The Communist Party thinks that all this can and must be changed, that the change is required by the will of the people and the interests of the country, and it rejoices in the demand presented to the national committee of the People's Assembly that it "initiate, without delay, a frank and free comparison of ideas from which would emerge a supplementary program, as well as new accord, and which would serve as a point of departure for a new period of action in common."

The Communist Party thinks there is interest in opening extensive discussion in order to appraise the lessons brought home by the experiences of the last two years.

It is a matter of drawing up the balance sheet of the People's Front and examining its weaknesses in order to correct them in the future.

Surely every one knows that it could not possibly have been the deliberations of the national committee of the People's Front which produced the successive devaluations and the "pause" or which resulted in granting the fascist leagues the authorization to reorganize under the label of parties, in enforcing one-sided non-intervention, and in letting governments resign without a vote of the Chamber.

In order that such errors may not be repeated, we propose that the conditions under which they were made shall be subjected to serious examination by the national committee of the People's Assembly, which shall proclaim that it bears no share of the guilt for them.

* * *

Furthermore, in the spirit of the broadest democracy, the Communist Party demands the convocation of a national congress of the People's Front which would permit the country to affirm again its will to see necessary measures taken to assure the application of the program adopted by the universal suffrage, and its will to supplement this program by new provisions.

These new provisions must be directed against the trusts, against the capitalist coalitions whose malpractice, whose methods of corruption and pressure are now widely known and have been condemned by all the organizations of the People's Front. . . .

Sure of translating the sentiments of the toiling masses of France, and certain of asking nothing which has not been approved or admitted by

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the various organizations in the People's Front, the Communist Party thinks it is necessary to proceed from formulas to actions, and it proposes that in the program of the People's Front the following demands shall be inscribed:

Nationalize trusts and private monopolies, beginning with insurance and electric companies, in such a way that the great capitalists shall derive no advantages and no profits from these nationalizations, of which the sole object shall be to serve collective and not private interests;

Control trusts, industrial associations, cartels, and agencies in order to put an end to the speculation on rise of prices to which these capitalist coalitions devote themselves

Control the accounts of the banks, to assure control of the exportations of capital, to guarantee savings, to prevent fiscal fraud, and control the public credit;

Elevate the moral level of public life by forbidding high functionaries, acting and retired, and elective officers, acting and retired, to enter the service of capitalist concerns; this in order to put an end to the scandal of certain memberships in these administrative councils, as in the case of the Suez Canal Company;

Right the financial situation by democratic reform and also by progressive surtaxes on the great fortunes (the Communist Party alone has conducted a campaign in favor of this point for many long months, but the various parties of the People's Front have admitted the principle by the very fact that they approved the projects of the preceding government);

Defend the democratic wishes of the nation by enlarging the electoral college of the Senate and by applying the proportional system in the election of the two legislative assemblies.

* * *

In making these proposals the Communist Party is sure of being entirely in agreement with the Confédération Générale du Travail; it is certain of having proposed nothing which has not already been considered by the various parties of the People's Front, and it is convinced that its proposals harmonize with those of the Socialist Party.

As for the country, it undoubtedly approves these proposals in general. A magnificent demonstration of the popular approval will be provided by the convocation of a national congress of the People's Front.

In the spirit of the most complete fidelity to the People's Front and its program the Communist Party intends to continue to act under the standard of the union consecrated by the oath sworn on July 14, 1935:

"We swear to remain united to defend democracy, to disarm and dissolve the fascist leagues, to put our liberties beyond the reach of fascism. On this day on which the first victory of the Republic lives again, we swear to defend the democratic liberties won by the people of France, to give bread to the toilers, work to the youth, and a great human peace to the world."

LESSONS OF THE IRISH ELECTIONS

BY R. PALME DUTT

Daily Worker, London, June 27, 1938

IN IRELAND'S elections last week Labor has suffered a defeat. Fresh from his agreement with Chamber-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lain, De Valera has won the absolute majority he demanded to set up a "strong government" which will implement the new strategic bargains behind the agreement. Labor's representation fell from 13 to 9. From all the teeming working class of Dublin Labor has now no member. In an increased total poll Labor's vote has fallen.

Has this no lessons for us in Britain? Yes, despite the deep differences in conditions, it has big lessons. The penalty of a narrow, passive reformist policy and leadership, denunciation of the "twin enemies, communism and fascism," silence on the world struggle against fascism, replacement of all mention of socialism by the official aim of a "Christian social order," and barren Parliamentary maneuvering in place of any attempt to unite the masses in active struggle for their burning needs, are here written very sharply for all to see.

The resulting situation in Ireland is now a menacing point in the world situation. The needs and possibilities for mass revival are urgent.

Twenty-five years ago Irish labor, in the days of the leadership of Connolly and Larkin and the great Dublin struggle of 1913, was in the vanguard of the labor movement of Western Europe. It was the Irish working class, under militant leadership, that made the pace in the political situation, put the issue of the republic on the map, and with Connolly and the Citizen Army was the backbone of the Easter Rising in 1916.

But thereafter the leading role of Labor was lost under the subsequent weak reformist leadership, and passed over to middle class nationalism.

The Labor Party damned itself by supporting the Free State Treaty of 1921, which was maintained, with British aid, by the reactionary big business forces who rallied behind Griffiths and Cosgrave. The national struggle against the treaty, the struggle of the small farmers against the land annuities, were led by the small middle class elements represented by De Valera and Fianna Fail, who swept to power with mass support and a big program of promises in 1932.

De Valera was able to carry out minor steps of national advance in the constitutional sphere, although abandoning the republican claim by the recognition of British kingship in the Act of 1936, and certain social reforms.

For six years he maintained the resistance to Britain's economic war over the land annuities. But in the end, middle class nationalism, fearful of evoking the mass forces which could alone finally complete Irish liberation, could only finish in compromise with British imperialism.

De Valera ended in the treaty with Chamberlain in 1938, and declared that, apart from the remaining question of partition, the Irish people is "free."

What is the character of the "freedom" that the Irish people has won under middle class national leadership?

The poverty is so terrible that the population goes steadily down, despite the high birth-rate; 30,000 a year have emigrated in the last two years.

There are 105,000 unemployed out of a working class of half a million; and the employed workers in the last

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

year recorded, 1936-37, averaged only 28 weeks' work in the year.

The statutory agricultural wage is 24 shillings a week. Yet prices are higher than in Britain; the cost of living in February of this year was 73 per cent above 1914, compared with 57 per cent in Britain.

But for the profiteers it is a paradise. Between 1931 and 1936, output increased 38 per cent, while earnings of workers decreased 13 per cent. Between 1931 and 1936 Guinness Ordinary shares rose from 80s to 155s, Alliance Gas from 10s to 16s, Dublin Brick from 4s 2d to 13s, Hammond Lane Foundry from 27s 6d to 54s 9d. Between 1934 and 1936 the official index of stocks rose from 94 to 106.

The De Valera-Chamberlain Treaty is the key to the present political situation in Ireland. Two considerations led to that treaty.

First, the war situation. De Valera and Chamberlain are united on the side of fascism. This was shown in De Valera leading the way in recognizing the Italian conquest of Ethiopia, and equally in relation to Franco in Spain. The policy of the Vatican smoothed the way for the reconciliation. Ireland is being drawn into the British reactionary war bloc.

Less conspicuous, but no less important, is the Anglo-American antagonism. This underlies the special British strategic preparations in Ireland.

Second, the economic situation. The Banking Commission Report was signed in March and presented at the beginning of April. It has been withheld from publication till after the election. Challenged, De Valera pretended not to have read it yet. It is known to have presented a damning picture of the economic situation, which hastened the necessity of a quick reconciliation with Britain and prepares the way for new attacks on the standards of the masses.

In this election De Valera no longer made promises, save in the vaguest terms of "reconstruction." Instead, he spoke of the need of "strong government, the need to reorganize the trade unions as 'vocational bodies' separate from politics," etc. It is clear where this is leading.

In this menacing situation the strongest Labor challenge was essentially to awaken and mobilize the masses, not only the minority of industrial workers already following Labor, but the masses of workers and small farmers who still follow Fianna Fail as the seeming popular party against the reaction represented by Cosgrave.

This challenge and leadership was lacking. The Labor Party let itself be maneuvered into a position in which it appeared to be linked up with Cosgrave against Fianna Fail.

It was the combined vote of Labor and Cosgrave that defeated the De Valera government and precipitated the election. This combined vote, even although on a justified issue, was a tactical error.

The Labor campaign was almost entirely directed against Fianna Fail, and appeared as if indifferent to the menace of reaction represented by Cosgrave, instead of directing its main fight against the menace of reaction, showing the tendency of capitulation of the Fianna Fail leadership to the reaction, and appealing to the Fianna Fail masses to join them.

Labor's main strength of appeal

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

should have been the social mass appeal, combined with the national appeal, in a way to win the sympathy of the Fianna Fail masses. Instead, Labor sought to score points by jeering at Fianna Fail as imperialist, as "national apostates," etc.—a line of attack which, in face of the deep suspicions of the imperialist past of the Labor Party, was an inevitable boomerang.

There was no attempt to agitate and mobilize the masses in a real campaign around burning issues.

The outlook for the future situation in Ireland is urgent. De Valera, possessed of his absolute majority for five years, and pressed by the serious economic situation and the needs of new expenditure for rearmament, will undoubtedly proceed to reactionary measures, including measures against the trade unions and civil liberties, paving the way towards a type of clerical fascism.

A great revival of the Labor movement is urgently needed, the strengthening of the Labor Party, more Socialist propaganda, the realization of trade union unity, the organization of the unemployed, and advance on a positive program of demands.

In all this the Communist Party of Ireland can play an indispensable role which can at the same time build its own strength.

At the same time the ground can be prepared, through close contact with the small farmers, the remaining republican elements and the Left wing of Fianna Fail, for the realization, as the reactionary role of De Valera becomes manifest and arouses disillusionment and struggle from the mass of his supporters, of a future People's Front, against the narrowing reaction of the probable future coalition of De Valera and Cosgrave.

ITALIAN PROBLEMS

BY CESARE MASSINE

Lo Stato Operaio, theoretical fortnightly organ of the Communist Party of Italy, June 15, 1938. (Published in Paris.)

WORK IN THE FASCIST TRADE UNIONS

By the law of 1926 and other subsequent laws, fascism, after having destroyed the free class trade unions, created and activated by the workers, has instituted compulsory "unions," which, inspired by the interests of the government and the bosses, must serve only to control the masses and stifle their legitimate aspirations. Fascism and the bosses, for that matter, continuously violate the very trade union laws and regulations which they themselves have established, to the detriment of the workers.

But despite the fascist and boss repression, the most militant part of the proletariat has begun to find (and within these very same fascist unions) possibilities of struggle to defend their interests, and these new forms of struggle constitute one of the most characteristic aspects of the present-day class struggle in Italy.

One of the lines of action which our Party has maintained for several years, in spite of the sectarian resistance of many anti-fascists, has been just this conquest and utilization of the possibilities of struggle within the fascist unions, for the defense of the work-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ers' bread and liberty, and for the restoration of self-confidence and militancy to the workers oppressed and divided by fascism. Today the supporters of such tactics in the fascist unions are growing in numbers. This is also due to the work of clarification undertaken by the Party but, above all, it is due to the positive and direct experience of the masses directly concerned.

Now the bosses and the fascist officials, to whom it becomes evident that threats and repression are not enough to stifle the class activity of the more militant workers, have effected other "corporative reforms," that is, even more reactionary measures with which they seek to eliminate all possibilities of making demands in the unions. They want to "clean out fascist syndicalism" and make it an organization of the type of Hitler's "Labor Front."

It is the task of the Communists, of the workers' vanguard, to put themselves at the head of the struggle against the "Hitlerization" of the unions, which tends to obstruct and cut off the least possibility of class activity within the unions.

THE NEW PIECE-WORK REGULATIONS

It is particularly interesting to cite a few examples of the struggle over this question, which is of constant pressing immediacy to several hundred thousand workers of the most important "categories."

The fascist "hierarchs" have been forced to concern themselves with this problem more than once: on a national scale in October, 1931, and November, 1934, in the Fiat plant in February, 1935, and in the mines in October, 1937. The same problem of piece-work rates was one of the grievances which brought about the annulment of the steel work contract in 1932; the hearings dragged on until July, 1936, to an entirely unsatisfactory conclusion.

For that reason, the discontent of the workers has never decreased; the rank and file has never ceased to protest and to demand an unequivocal and more advantageous solution, whereas the bosses continue to haggle over the piece-work rates and other measures in the regulations, to the disadvantage of the workers.

In December, 1937, the Corporative Central Committee had to promulgate some new standards that were represented as definitive. Since January of this year, the whole fascist press has devoted entire pages to exalting the great importance of the measures taken. In reality, these measures represented a certain improvement over the preceding ones, and if honestly applied could have halted some of the more crying injustices which the rank and file had long condemned. But even in this case, one of the characteristics of the fascist regime manifested itself: the laws, the regulations, the general and particular measures that affect the life of the workers are from the very first drawn up in a unilateral and reactionary way; but the practical application of them is even more vexatious and oppressive, unless those concerned succeed in finding in unity the way and the strength to force at least some regard for the literal text of the law or the regulation.

Wherever the workers have understood that the new regulation of piece-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

work rates offered a legal base for the defense of their standard of living (constantly depressed by reductions of pay on innumerable pretexts of the industrialists, by ever new deductions more or less "voluntary," and by the continually mounting costs of living), a wave of class activity has swept over the plants--complaints, protests, collective agitation in many localities; in some places, where there are more politically capable workers, these agitations and protests have been linked with the struggle against war, and particularly against the fascist aggression on Spain, by such slogans: "Pay the workers more wages, instead of spending billions to assassinate our brothers in Spain!"

Where the workers have done this —and in all the factories this could and should be done—the fascist officials have been forced to permit meetings and to intermediate; often they do this in a spirit of demagogy intended to bluff the workers, but at times they must persuade the bosses not to go too far, to make some concessions, for fear the protests of the rank and file may "make trouble."

In one big factory, after six months, the piece-work requirements, fixing the number of pieces to work and the rates and prices for each piece, had not yet been listed. Even the fascist workers joined in the protests of the rank and file, as well as the shop delegates and the members of the directory councils, who are also workers. All of them went to the fascist union to protest, and the official was forced to take action.

Where this does not happen, it is because there are still too many elements among the body of workers who play the bosses' game, deepening the differences and the division among the workers with abstract political and religious discussions, instead of subordinating everything to the unity (which is strength) of all the workers, for the defense of their common interests.

STRUGGLES IN THE FASCIST UNIONS

In the same factory the workers obtained, by their protests, the application of the standards fixed by the Central Corporative Committee stabilizing the rates as long as the present methods of work continued; they also obtained the establishment of a technical committee for the control of piece-work, composed of a representative of the management, a representative of the union, and an inspector from the Central Corporative Committee. To both of these demands the management turned deaf ears, and the decision of the Central Corporative Committee confirming them was obtained only by the united action of the workers compelling the convocation of the union assembly.

It is interesting to note that at the conclusion of the meeting, the workers were granted their demand that the deliberations be recorded in an official communication. As this struggle and its outcome were made known, workers in other plants were inspired to fight for the application of decisions favorable to them. This case seems to us an eloquent reply to all those skeptics and adversaries of the tactics advocating the use of every possibility, no matter how slight, of struggle against the arrogance and the starvation tactics of the bosses.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AGAINST THE NON-COMPLIANCE OF MANAGEMENTS

Shortly after the adoption of the new piece-work regulations, the management of a plant in Turin arbitrarily reduced the rates. The workers protested, and went to the union in a body. The union, which had to acknowledge the justice of the workers' complaints, requested the management to restore the standard rates. The management refused to do so, even finding an excuse for protesting against the union, claiming that it had not observed all the rules of procedure.

Under the pressure of the united workers, the union was forced to maintain its position. It appealed to the Central Corporative Committee of the province, which appointed a technical committee of control. The latter, acknowledging the justice of the workers' claims, asked the management to raise the rates and to grant the workers a thousand lire as reimbursement for damage sustained. As the firm refused again to give the workers their just due, the case was brought before the respective national confederations and the Minister of Corporations.

Even the newspaper *Lavoro Fascista (Fascist Labor)* had to refer (in its way) to the hearing, and commented: "It is unnecessary to insist upon the legitimacy of the workers' demands, which received such prompt and solicitous recognition." It is a bit exaggerated, to say the least, to characterize as "prompt and solicitous recognition" a mediation which has dragged on for four months without producing a solution favorable to the workers. On the contrary, the complaint would certainly have been suppressed if it had not been for the vigilance and militancy of the workers concerned.

What might have happened, what punitive measures might have been taken, if the workers had accepted such flagrant non-compliance with decisions which have the force of law? The answer comes to mind immediately in the shape of a vivid recollection: some years ago, in Turin, too, four shop delegates, fascists, were exiled to the Islands for having supported the workers' rights in a category assembly.

AGAINST ARBITRARY DISCHARGES

The management of a big plant recently fired a group of 250 workers. These workers understood that the management discharged them not because there was not enough work to keep them busy, not for any other technical reason, but simply to let loose a new wave of terror, to repress militancy.

The discharged workers, together with a large number of other employees of the plant, met in the union headquarters, asking that organization to intervene against the bosses' arbitrary act. The discussion was very heated, so much so that a fascist union official telephoned for the police. But the appearance of the police had no effect on the workers, who remained as they were, maintaining, "We are in our own place, which we have earned by our toil." The police had to go.

Only then did the heads of the union consent to listen to the workers' grievances and give assurance that

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they would look into the matter. The workers proposed to go to the political authorities at once and demand an immediate intervention, asking a union head to accompany them "out of respect to ranking officials." There followed a long discussion on this point, because these hierarchs did not want to "compromise themselves"; but in the end the union head had to promise that he would accompany the workers, proposing, however, that not the whole body should go to the political authorities en masse, but only a delegation.

Accepting these conditions, the workers elected their delegation and decided that the response of the political authorities be communicated to the assembly that same evening. The workers adopted the resolution that all must come to the assembly meeting together, gathering at a designated place beforehand, so as to prevent any possibility of pressure being put on small single groups by the authorities, who then might use the pretext of poor attendance to close the meeting without taking any action.

As a matter of fact, when the workers arrived at the union headquarters, they found that the entrance was guarded, but as they had all come in one solid body, no one dared say anything to them. During the meeting, the union official who had accompanied the delegation, duly impressed by the compactness of the mass of workers, ordered the immediate reinstatement of those workers discharged, even if it meant exceeding the customary number of workers in the plant. There can be no mistaking the effect of this complete victory, won by sticking together, under particularly difficult conditions (a mass lay-off), in raising the morale of the rank and file, and strengthening their unity and will to struggle.

In This Issue Earl Browder Reviews

THE UNITED FRONT

PROBLEMS OF WORKING CLASS UNITY AND THE PEOPLE'S FRONT IN THE STRUGGLE AGAINST FASCISM AND WAR

BY GEORGI DIMITROFF

290 Pages Price $2.00

"A Book of International Significance"

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOK REVIEWS

A SOCIAL APPROACH TO MATHEMATICS

MATHEMATICS FOR THE MILLION. By Lancelot Hogben. Illustrations by J. F. Horrabin, 617 pp., W. W. Norton & Co. Inc., New York, 1937, $3.75.

TWO REVIEWS of this book, published simultaneously in a recent number of *Isis*, a periodical dedicated to the history of science, give a good appreciation of the technical virtues and weaknesses of this book. Professor Ashley-Montagu, of New York University, praises it exuberantly:

"This book is probably the best introduction to mathematics that has ever been written. Thereafter, there can no longer be any excuse for anyone to plead that mathematics is beyond him, for no matter how unmathematically minded the individual may be, if he but undertakes to work through this book with no more application than the solution of a crossword puzzle would take, he cannot fail to acquire an unusual working knowledge of mathematics. The book, which was written during a long illness in hospital, is a remarkable achievement of clear and painless exposition. . . . Professor Hogben gives *reasons* for everything, moreover, he gives an operational history of the development of mathematics in its actual socially functioning context. This is admirable, but it takes a scientist with a social consciousness to do it. . . ."

Professor H. T. Davis, a mathematician of Indiana University, retorts:

"However, one must still heed the famous reply of Euclid to King Ptolemy: 'There is no royal road to geometry.' Mathematics can never be made easy, although it is probably desirable to make it appear so. One of the most celebrated examples of these attempts to popularize mathematics was the intriguing *Calculus Made Easy*, by Sylvanus Thompson, with its cheering motto: 'What one fool can do, another can' (from an old simian proverb). Certainly many a college youth has been lured into these insecure fields by the initial simplicity of the book. It is probable that *Mathematics for the Million* will perform a similar function."

There is another characteristic aspect of Professor Hogben's book which will concern us more in this place than its mere technical virtues as a textbook. The author obtains his success in no small way by his consistent emphasis on the social significance of mathematical invention and discovery. He shows how all mathematics grows out of the struggle of mankind for existence. This implies the use of the materialistic method; and the author often uses a reasoning and comes to conclusions to which Marxists will gladly agree. They will be grateful to an auther who, for the first time, expresses these ideas in a popular book. We must nevertheless be extremely careful and not take Hogben's book for a consistently materialist study of mathematics or even of the history of mathematics. We shall try to evaluate here how far we can go with the author, but also point out where, according to our understanding, he departs from materialism. Let us first follow his steps.

The author is perfectly clear about his intentions:

"As mathematics has been taught and expounded in schools no effort is made to show its social history, its significance in our own social lives, the immense dependence of civilized mankind upon it. Neither as children nor as adults are we told how the knowledge of this grammar has been used again and again throughout history to assist in the liberation of mankind from superstition. We are not shown how it may be used by us to defend the liberties of the people." (pp. 20-21.)

This is a decided break with the customary way of presenting mathematics as a leisure subject to be studied for its own sake, for developing the mind, or for certain simple practical reasons. It also breaks with the customary presentation of the history of mathematics as a series of accidental biographies and anecdotes. There is a reason for

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

each kind of mathematics, and this reason is not the whim of some scientist, but the necessity which has existed to solve certain specific vital problems under certain social-economic conditions. Mathematics grows in lively contact with the struggle for control of nature. The particular subjects show in content and form the period in which they originated. Plane and solid geometry show the marks of an antique society with a leisure class and slavery. Arithmetic shows a struggling mercantile class in early capitalism. Calculus reflects early engineering. The history of mathematics is "a mirror of civilization, interlocking with man's common culture, his inventions, his economic arrangements, his religious beliefs." (p. 34.) An author, who has undertaken the exposition of this viewpoint and who has tackled it with the ability which this book displays, has fulfilled a new and important task and contributed valuable material to our social-scientific heritage.

To give an example of Hogben's method we take his treatment of trigonometry, or in his language: "The size of the world, or what you can do with Trigonometry." We are introduced to old Alexandria, founded in the fourth century B.C. by Alexander the Great. This town, with a mixed population of Egyptians, Greeks, and Jews, became a great center of commerce and manufacture:

"Alexandria drew into itself all the learning of the ancient world, the arts of medicine, dyeing, machinery and navigation. . . . The three hundred years which intervened before the advent of Caesar's armies . . . saw perhaps the most astonishing efflorescence of intellectual adventure in the history of mankind. . . . Under Roman rule Alexandria retained its position as the intellectual center of the civilized world, as it likewise remained the great center of the handicrafts and an important port of the Mediterranean trade."

In this economic and intellectual focus mathematics was once again "in lively contact with the world's work," with problems of navigation, astronomy, geography, geodesy and engineering. Aristarchus of Samos made the first estimate of the relative distances of the moon and the sun from the earth. Hipparchus contributed greatly to theoretical astronomy, Archimedes (of Syracuse, but in close contact with Alexandria) made the first known model in which the rotation of the celestial sphere and the changing position of the stars were represented by the motion of a wheel. Erathostenes measured the circumference of the earth. All this required a considerable amount of mathematics and especially the measurement of angles and their relations to distances, which is trigonometry. The first tables of sines were made in Alexandria.

This exposition of Hogben gives a reason for the origin and the existence of trigonometry, though it neglects somewhat the contributions of the mathematicians of early capitalism in this field. It shows how mathematics developed in the struggle for control of nature, how it is used "to defend the liberties of the people." It also shows something more:

"The history of science never confirms the popular belief that discoveries are made singly by the isolated genius. They are invariably made about the same time by a number of different people. This is a commonplace of scientific history, though historians of science rarely disclose the simple explanation. Discoveries repeat themselves because intellectual work proceeds along the lines laid down by the social culture which the individual discoverer inherits."

We understand now how our modern arithmetical methods, our algebra, our analytical geometry, our calculus, originated, on a foundation laid by the slavery society of antiquity, during and through the great economic revolutions of the fifteenth-seventeenth centuries which brought a merchant class and an industrial capitalist class into existence. Where Euclidean plane and solid geometry, constructed by a Greek leisure class supported by slave labor, expresses statical properties of figures and emphasizes the logical aspect, analytic geometry, developed under early capitalism in the period in and after the great navigations, expresses time and hence continuity. Under the pressure of present social requirements again new tendencies in mathematics arise:

"In contrast with the mathematics of the Greeks, the mathematics of the Reformation was dynamic. It took time into account. In contrast with the requirements of a mathematics which would be necessary to deal with the whole range of modern knowledge, Reformation mathematics is *non-historical*. It does not take fully into account the historic past. It arose in the age of merchant

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enterprise, when ships were using astronomy to steer on the high seas. For astronomical purposes the historic past is unimportant because the characteristics of the universe of stars change so little during a period which affects man's social needs. So we can use the same principles for calculating when an eclipse *did* and when an eclipse *will* occur. Modern physics, modern chemistry and modern biology are immensely preoccupied with problems of growth and decay. The historic past is becoming the all-important issue in natural science. In the twilight of mercantile culture, the future of the human reason depends more and more on understanding human relationships in the light of historic experience. We are beginning to see that a mathematics which allows us to move is not enough. We need a mathematics which can concern itself with whence we came and whither we are going." (P. 451.)

We have quoted this paragraph with the more pleasure, as it is one of the places where we see that the author's study of the social value of mathematics can bring him to the broader field of dialectical materialism. Engels could have included such a statement in his dialectics of nature. The author, however, himself would protest against this accusation. We have here, indeed, reached the limits of his understanding. He is violently opposed to dialectics; he "only" wants to show the social content of mathematics. He cannot see that the latter is shallow without the first. He likes to take from dialectical materialism certain simple historical recipes, confine himself to these alone, and let the real content of materialism go to naught as sheer nonsense. It is at this point that we must take issue with him.

Hogben is most emphatic about his rejection of dialectics, shouts it all over town so that nobody can miss it. He speaks of the "squabbles of Hegelian Calvinists" in Soviet Russia (p. 301). After having amused himself with the theological speculations of Napier, Stifel and other Renaissance mathematicians, he exclaims:

"It is easy to find excuses for Stifel or Napier. It is more difficult to understand why some well-meaning socialists should weary us with tiresome disputations about the Hegelian dialectic." (P. 477.)

It does not occur to Hogben that there might be something wrong with his own ideals if such "well-meaning socialists" as Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin have taken the trouble to weary us with their "tiresome disputations." This fact, indeed, sharply indicates the limitations of Hogben's book and perhaps of Hogben's genius. He has learned and appreciated only partly Hessen's classical essay on Newton in *Science at the Cross Roads,* saw some of his results and failed to grasp the roots from which they grew. This failure to understand the foundations of his own historical method leaves its imprint on the whole book. The historical explanation is often insufficient, the treatment of mathematical subject matter often superficial, and the foundations positivist and pragmatic more than materialist.

The customary type of textbook on a mathematical subject shows how each step follows logically from the one before without much reference to the use for taking it. *Mathematics for the Million,* without generally lacking in logical construction, tries above all to show how each step follows historically from the step before, and what the use is for taking it. The author points this out explicitly (p. 35).

The philosophical weakness of the author, however, leads him into considerable omissions and misrepresentations in carrying this program through. He misses the relation between theory and practice. Useful mathematics, for him, grows directly and only from practical considerations; theory is only, or should only be, a direct reflection of practice; navigation brings trigonometry, mercantile activity brings algebra and arithmetics, engineering brings calculus. He has only scorn for the geometrical and arithmetical speculations of a Pythagoras or a Plato. We read about Pythagorean number speculations:

"This rubbish was highly intriguing to the prospering townspeople who had an itch for change, characteristic of a rapidly expanding society. The audiences of Pythagoras wanted charades. He gave them brighter and better charades." (P. 190.)

We doubt if prosperous townspeople, itching for a change, are particularly attracted by charades. Such a statement is typically pseudo-materialistic, it explains nothing despite its use of economic terms. The true character of Pythagorean number mysticism (which still survives, in modified way, in Christian doctrines about the Trinity)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has already been much better explained by the despised Hegel, who shows that this mysticism was an attempt at a philosophy of nature by too simplified methods. The dialectics of nature is too complicated to be adequately represented by the poor dialectics of elementary arithmetics. Through the whole history of science run the attempts to understand nature by finding simple harmonies and laws. Kepler, Newton, Faraday were inspired by such ideas. The modern theory of groups, which lies at the foundation of atom physics, is the newest aspect of the same tendency. The materialistic principle that the world is intelligible requires that it possess harmonies, simple properties that can be grasped and used as the basis for explanation. Pythagoras' work is a first stage of a perfectly legitimate method. It immediately carried results in two fields, that of music and that of mathematics.

There is more of a similar nature in Hogben's book. Platonic geometry may have been mainly the pastime of a leisure class. This, however, does not necessarily kill its value. Mozart's operas were also conceived in the atmosphere of a leisure class. Their musical value remains unimpaired. The priceless heritage of Pythagoras' and Plato's school in mathematics is of strictness or rigor, *i.e.*, the necessary connection between premises and conclusions. Although rigor, this ironclad logical construction, gives mathematics its particular place in the sciences, Hogben has little to say about it. Yet, without it mathematics would lose its scientific value, its character as adequate image of the quantity relations in the real world. It would become a combination of tricks. Marx knew this very well and spent considerable time in solving for himself and for Engels the problem of a rigorous foundation of the calculus.

Such a foundation looks very much like some kind of "Hegelian squabble," but it is as necessary for mathematics as the Marxian theory of value is to the labor movement. The history of mathematics shows an endless process of action and reaction between new discoveries and pioneer work on one side, and consolidation and logical reconstruction on the other. This dialectics of scientific building is itself a reflection of social dialectics. The introduction of abstract, logical deduction into mathematics remains perhaps the most important contribution of the Greeks. The last ten years have increased our knowledge of Babylonian and Egyptian mathematics considerably, but have not shaken this conviction that mathematics as a science in the modern sense is due to the Greeks.

The search for precise definitions, definite premises and strict proofs in mathematics is not a pastime of scientists with a narrow conscience. Mathematics requires rigor, as we have seen, because it is an image of the quantity relations in the real world. Quantity and order relations possess this subtle structure independent of the human mind. This is clearly demonstrated by the fact that mathematical speculations, which seem at first "Hegelian squabbles," show their use as reflections of actual phenomena. During the middle of last century the German mathematician Weierstrass discovered certain mathematical subtleties so esoteric that his own colleagues called them "pathologic." Today these subtle speculations have led to modern Lebesgue integration which has been shown to be at the bottom of the explanation of all statistical phenomena. Einstein's theories of time and space, which have considerably influenced our notions of the universe as a whole and of atom physics, are based upon a type of mathematics, the tensor calculus, which can also be used for the subtle axiomatics of geometry.

A result of Hogben's underestimation of speculative work is that the limit concept, the most fundamental concept of modern mathematics, finds no treatment in *Mathematics for the Million*. This weakens considerably the chapter on the calculus, where the reader gets the entirely wrong impression that the calculus is only approximately true. Berkeley and other idealists have tried this argument to fight the materialist doctrines derived from Newton's theory. They claimed that he who believes in the absurdities of the calculus, which gives correct results by making mistakes, cannot blame other people who believe in the miracles of religion. The calculus is not only historically interesting as a mathematical result of engineering in early industrial capitalism (opposed to mercantile capitalism with its algebra); it is also logically interesting as a case where the laws

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of dialectics can be studied in intimate details.

These omissions are not accidental, but a result of the author's refusal to follow his materialistic inclinations to their inevitable conclusion: to dialectical materialism. V. J. Jerome, in the December, 1937, issue of *The Communist,* has shown the confusion in Hogben's mind as evidenced in a recent paper written for *Science and Society*—this confusion is due to the same cause. In *Common Sense* of February, 1938, Hogben has gone even a step further on the road back. Under these circumstances we may be pleased that Hogben, in the final chapter to *Mathematics for the Million,* called "Epilogue to Science, or Mathematics in the Real World," rather consistently expresses a materialist point of view, as indicated in the title, and in places like the following:

"We have to make 'laws' of discourse to regulate the communication of laws which are made without our help. The latter are the real laws of nature, and they do not change because Einstein is a better mathematician than Newton was."

"Einstein's robust common sense has not prevented his disciples from erecting his teaching into a new system of theological apologetics. The followers of Mach, who anticipated some of Einstein's criticisms of Newton's mechanics, had already anticipated their exploits." (P. 641.)

But Hogben is not always very clear about his position:

"The sequel of Einstein's teachings was a comic controversy about whether science is a true picture of the world. Science is not a picture of anything. It is an ordnance map to direct our efforts in changing the world." (P. 641.)

Statements like this may suggest positivist and Machian conceptions that our scientific theories are but schemes to arrange the facts in nature for our proper convenience. Science may occasionally be described as an ordnance map to direct our efforts to change the world, but it can only continue to guide us when it gives a true picture of certain properties of this world. In so far as a scientific theory expresses a reality, it is a true picture.

More obvious concessions to idealism mar the interpretation of probability. Mathematical probability, according to Hogben, arises "when there is no known reason why an action should be performed more often in one way than in any other ways" (p. 574). Statistical phenomena, therefore, depend on the state of our human knowledge. The dice in the beaker turn up the way they do, because man does not know why they should behave in another way. This explanation may be a convenient one, and a mathematical fiction. It may serve as an ordnance map to find our way. Nevertheless it cannot be a satisfactory, a scientific, explanation. The reason for the occurrence of statistical phenomena lies in nature, not in the powers, or lack of powers, of the human mind. Hogben approaches the history of statistics materialistically, but fails to see how strangely it contrasts with the idealist foundations of his theory.

There is much positivism in Hogben's utilitarian position with respect to mathematics. Mathematics is more than a "grammar of size," though its technique may very well be so named. And let us repeat once more: The fact that mathematics is developed to express quantity relations in a social frame does not mean that it has no life of its own. Already in the earlier stages of mathematical work, in ancient Egypt and Babylonia, we find speculations urged by love of the work itself. Later this type of activity increases substantially, with considerable results on the growth of mathematics, on the practical as well as the theoretical side. Mathematics gets such a powerful life of itself that whole schools of historians have seen nothing but this. It certainly constitutes a sound reaction to show the fundamental social background of a science. The semi-independent life of an abstract field of endeavor should not be neglected, its relation to the social background, its own fruits and the results. The deeper truths of nature are not understood without a study of its properties for their own sake. Without Pascal's and Leibnitz' abstractions we would not have the calculus. Without Euclid's and Apollonius' abstractions geometry would still be a handicraft and mathematicians would come within the jurisdiction of the carpenters' union.

Our conclusion must be that Hogben's book is a brilliant contribution to the popu-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

larization and the social understanding of mathematics. The philosophical weakness, however, due to the fact that the author has not tried to broaden his social interpretation of mathematics into dialectical materialism, impairs the value of the book and often substitutes flippancy for brilliancy, superficiality for clarity,* and utilitarianism for materialism. The charm of the presentation stands above criticism.

D. C. LUCAS.

THE FAMILY: PAST AND PRESENT

THE FAMILY: PAST AND PRESENT. By Bernhard J. Stern. For the Commission on Human Relations of the Progressive Education Association. D. Appleton-Century. New York, 1938. 461 pp. $2.75.

THE VALUE of a source book in the social sciences depends not only on the skill and acumen of the editor in choosing significant material, but, above all, on guiding principles determining sequence and intent in arrangement. Dr. Stern's collection of data on the history and structure of the family illustrates beautifully the value of dialectic principles applied to the preparation of such a book. Instead of a lifeless anthology, he has given us a living, organic study in which selections are interpreted and are also invested with significance by their very arrangement.

Beginning with a series of diversified pictures of family life in primitive societies, he permits us to trace the development of our own family structure from classical to early modern times by means of extracts from original ancient writers and from modern critical historians of the times. For the period of the industrial revolution and the nineteenth century the editor offers us a wide range of evidence, both primary and secondary, on the enormous changes in familial relations caused by the growth of capitalism. Always the emphasis is placed on shifts, contrasts and movement in the history of the institution. We see the busy and responsible chatelaine or Elizabethan gentlewoman becoming the completely idle, frivolous parasite; we see whole families of agricultural workers migrating to the cities in the eighteenth century, driven out of the villages and herded into slums to form the earliest generations of the proletariat; we see women and apprentices losing the skills and opportunities available to them under the system of guilds and household work, while capitalist exploitation of industry compelled the vast majority to remain in the ranks of oppressed and helpless victims.

The shift of production from household to factory brought in its train a great change in family life, with many tensions and unresolved contradictions. On the one hand, the brutally long hours of labor for working mothers and the prevalence of child labor destroyed much that was healthy in earlier family relationships; on the other, the loosening of family ties through industrial occupations made possible the first steps towards women's civil equality with men and the assertion of power by workers —both men and women—through organization.

Family groups were subjected to the strain resulting from an attempt to apply older patriarchal standards to a transformed situation involving greater independence for the individual members. Excerpts like Willystine Goodsell's "The American Family of the Nineteenth Century" present these contradictions vividly. The decisive analysis of them is, of course, to be found in the works of Marx and Engels, briefly excerpted in the present volume. Long familiarity cannot dull the incisive pertinence of the statement by Marx concerning the effect of nineteenth century industrialism on the family:

"However terrible, however repulsive, the break-up of the old family system within the organism of capitalist society may seem, none the less, large-scale industry, by assigning to women, and to young persons and children of both sexes, a decisive role in the socially organized process of production, and a role which has to be fulfilled outside the home, is building the new economic foun-

* There are a considerable number of incorrect details, not only on Hegel, on the Marxists and on the U.S.S.R. We find strange information on Pythagoras' ancestry and marriage. Information on Pacioli, Stevin, Briggs, on sundials and on longitude measurements is defective.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dation for a higher form of the family and of the relations between the sexes."

For the study of contemporary family life in America the book gives documentation of many kinds, covering situations in all classes. There are statistics on family incomes in the United States, gainful occupation of women, and child labor; specific studies of marriage, divorce, infant mortality, and size of families; poignant autobiographical or fictional glimpses of concrete family life in "Milltown, Mine and Metropolis" (excerpts from writers like Grace Lumpkin, Josephine Herbst and Angelo Herndon); sections on farm families and the impact of the depression on family life.

The final sections present less ponderable problems under the general headings of "Current Ideals and Realities" and "The Family Milieu." These include such matters as authority in the family, sexual adjustments, marital tensions, childhood and the shaping of personality within the family, and intermarriage. There is one short extract dealing with the family under fascism, and one on the Soviet Union. Pictures, diagrams, and pictorial statistics add greatly to the visual appeal of the book.

The head notes introducing the several sections point out with admirable clarity the purpose and direction of the selections. If anything, the reader might wish that these had been made longer; the editor might in certain instances have supplemented the facts and interpretations presented by the contributors. A Marxian reader will certainly think of some important factors which have not been touched upon, for instance, in Geoffrey May's otherwise admirable and scholarly treatment of *Christian Teachings on Sex;* but editorial modesty has, no doubt, restrained Dr. Stern from evaluations or additions. A Communist functioning actively in a world which he wishes to change will find his understanding of it greatly deepened by this many-sided study of one of our most important institutions. Even the remote and ancient forms of family life contribute something to the clarification of the contradictions in which we find ourselves today. It may be added that the book is well adapted to the general public which it is intended to reach. Its plan and some of its quotations may well induce readers to follow the subject along the lines of more specifically Marxian research.

VALERIA HODGES

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Speeches and Documents of the Tenth National Communist Party Convention

The Democratic Front: For Jobs, Security, Democracy and Peace, by Earl Browder . . 10c

Resolutions of the Tenth National Convention, Communist Party, U.S.A. 3c

Constitution and By-Laws of the Communist Party of the United States 5c

Communist Election Platform 1938 . . . . . 1c

A Message to Catholics, by Earl Browder . . 1c

o

Order from your local bookshop or from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

CUT ALONG THIS LINE AND MAIL TO

Date ..... 19....

THE COMMUNIST
P. O. Box 148, Station D
New York, N. Y.

Please enter my subscription to **The Communist** beginning with the ..... 19.. ..... issue.

Name .....

Address .....

City ..... State .....

Regular subscription $2.00 per year for 12 monthly issues
For Canadian and foreign subscriptions add fifty cents

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW BOOKS
On the INTERNATIONAL List

Just Out!

THE PERIL OF FASCISM
The Crisis of American Democracy

By A.B. MAGIL and HENRY STEVENS

This banner book of the season is a guidebook to the contemporary scene . . . $2.00

●

THE WAY THINGS ARE, by Albert Maltz . . . $1.50
Stirring stories of the class struggle in the U. S.

THE SPIDER AND THE CLOCK, by S. Funaroff.
Poems of today by a leading proletarian poet.
Paper .35
Cloth 1.00

LIFE OF LENIN, by P. Kerzhentsev 1.75
A new, popular, and authoritative biography.

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL, by V. I. Lenin 2.00
Volume X in the Selected Works of Lenin.

Now Ready!

WOMEN AND SOCIETY, by V. I. Lenin 10
Writings on the woman question.

HISTORY OF THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO OF MARX AND ENGELS, by V. Adoratsky 10
How the Manifesto was written.

NEGRO LIBERATION, by James S. Allen 05
Revised, expanded. 48 pages.

●

Order from your local bookshop or from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED